

# The Scottish Historical Review

VOL. IV., No. 16

JULY 1907

## Mary Stuart and the House of Huntly

THE overthrow of the house of Huntly by Mary Stuart, has been treated in a greater or less degree by Scottish historical writers as a problem which almost defies solution.

At first sight, undoubtedly, the destruction of the surviving bulwark of Scottish Roman Catholicism by a Scottish Roman Catholic Queen seems a wholly incomprehensible proceeding. It is incompatible with the religious sincerity of either the Queen or Huntly, and the secret of the explanation lies in the discovery of the treachery or lukewarmness of either one or other.

If the ordinarily accepted version of Mary as an ardent Romanist who was returning to Scotland, in the words of Mr. Froude, 'with a purpose resolutely formed to trample down the Reformation,' be allowed to pass muster, the mystery is one which becomes involved in Cimmerian darkness; but if, upon the other hand, the Queen is regarded merely in the light of a Laodicean bent only upon seating herself in the throne of Elizabeth, there is little that is really complex left in the episode.

As to Huntly himself, his reputation was undeniably that of a double-dealer, but there exists no evidence to show that his policy was one whit more disingenuous in its character than that pursued by any of the other party leaders of the period. All writers, however, whether biased by Marian or Reformation sympathies, have agreed in demanding from the unfortunate head of the house of Gordon a standard of rectitude which has been exacted from none of his contemporaries. Historically considered, it is no exaggeration to say that Huntly

has been a target for the partisans of two contending factions. Calumniated upon one side by the Marian apologists, who have seen in him only a blot upon the memory of the object of their devotion, he has fared equally ill at the hands of the glorifiers of the Reformation, to whom he has presented himself merely in the light of the upholder of the doctrines of the 'Scarlet Woman' and the enemy of Murray.

Of such credit as attaches to fidelity to his religion, it is, after one or two deductions are made, impossible to deprive Huntly. He was the right hand of Cardinal Beaton throughout the earlier stages of the Reformation struggle, and although after his capture at Pinkie, when confronted with the prospect of an indefinite confinement in an English prison, he made, like all his brother nobles, secret terms with Henry VIII., yet only a few months after he reverted to his natural allegiance and voted for the marriage of the Princess Mary with the Dauphin of France.

It is entirely in connection with his relations to Mary of Lorraine that the charges of lack of good faith against the 'Cock of the North' have been preferred, but when investigated these are found to rest upon no substantial basis. It was almost entirely through the instrumentality of Huntly that the Dowager succeeded in ousting Chatelherault from his office of Regent and seating herself in the position thus vacated, and the reward meted out to him consisted in fines, imprisonment, and deprivation of his governorship of the Orkneys. In the Chancellorship, which had been conferred upon him in 1546, he was likewise practically superseded by de Rubay, a French parasite of his late confederate, and thus rendered as far as possible a cipher in Scottish politics. As to the ground alleged for the infliction of all these formidable penalties, which was the miscarriage of the expedition against Clanranald, it can be regarded in no other light than that of a pretext of the flimsiest character. The real motives were jealousy of the northern kinglet and distrust of his attitude upon the question of the importation of the French soldiery.

The pivot upon which the policy of Mary of Lorraine ever turned was the conversion of Scotland into an oversea province of France, and the part that religion played in it was one of a very subsidiary character. Why it should have constituted the duty of Huntly to further in any way such unpatriotic designs, is a question that his numerous assailants can best

answer. The path which he had to tread throughout the whole period of the Regency was one of a peculiarly thorny description. After the bitter hostility that had been manifested towards him by Mary of Lorraine, it was evident that safety lay only in the direction of an understanding with England and the Lords of the Congregation. If he played the part to a certain extent of the trimmer, it was merely to avoid the fate of being ground between the upper and the nether millstone. So far as his frustration of the design of the Regent to invade England is concerned, he unquestionably deserved well at the hands of his country.

On the breaking out of the conflict between Mary of Lorraine and the Protestants, Huntly at first set aside his grievances and acted as the ally of the former. In 1559 he interposed between the rival factions as peace-maker, and finally on behalf of the Regent signed the agreement which brought about the evacuation of Edinburgh. Upon her subsequent infringement of the terms of that treaty, however, he joined Chatelherault, in accordance with the obligations of his bond, and went over to the Lords of the Congregation. It was in no way surprising that he should have dreaded a further exploitation of himself, and felt little inclined to undergo the humiliation of once more figuring before the world in the character of a 'sucked orange.'

As to the professions of Presbyterianism made by Huntly, they seem to have been without serious intention, and certainly never imposed upon either friend or foe. The very outrageousness of the behaviour in which he indulged upon the few occasions that he did attend the services at St. Giles, serves at least to acquit him of any charge of deception. At no time were the suspicions of his co-religionists excited, or the distrust of the Reformers allayed.

In his own house the chief of the house of Gordon never so much as affected to comply with any change of religion. The most conclusive testimony, however, of the nature of the aspirations which he at heart never ceased to cherish, was the discovery, after the completion of his downfall, at Strathbogie Castle of the utensils of Aberdeen Cathedral carefully preserved with a view to what his denouncers would have described as the restoration of the 'old idolatry.'

The misapprehension which finally brought about the subversion of Huntly, seems undoubtedly to have been his belief

in the genuineness of Mary's Catholicism. In this, though doomed to be bitterly deceived, he was just as much at sea as were the leaders of the Calvinists. Of the fact that Mary had landed upon the shores of Scotland indifferent to all issues but that of the English succession, both factions were equally ignorant. None of the rebuffs heaped upon Huntly had the effect of dislodging this prepossession from his mind. The frigid reception accorded to Leslie at St. Dizier, when, acting practically as the 'Cock o' the North's' emissary, he endeavoured to persuade the young Queen to land at Aberdeen and fling herself into the arms of the Catholics, might alone have served the purpose of a danger-signal, but no omen could arouse him to a sense of his peril. Huntly was, however, indulging in no idle bravado when he said that he could 'set-up the mass in three shires,' and Mary would have been wiser in her generation had she, with all its risks, accepted his invitation.

It is more than probable that the fate of the chief of the house of Gordon was sealed with the failure of Leslie's mission. Upon the Queen's return she placed herself entirely in the hands of Lethington and Lord James Stuart. Huntly, though still nominally Chancellor, was once more relegated entirely to the background. By his opposition to the meeting of the two Queens, he provoked further resentment, and England having drifted into war with France, something was needed to inspire confidence in the bosom of Elizabeth. Orthodoxy counted for little in Mary's eyes when weighed in the balances against the English succession, and a scapegoat was incontinently found in Huntly.

His third son, Sir John Gordon, had involved himself in a discreditable marriage with the widow of Ogilvie of Findlater, and the result was a brawl in the Edinburgh streets, when Lord Ogilvie was wounded. Gordon was imprisoned, but succeeded in escaping, and fled to his father. Here was a weapon conveniently placed in the hands of the Queen, and she promptly availed herself of it. A progress to visit her northern subjects was immediately planned. Lord James Stuart, who eagerly coveted the earldom of Moray, which Huntly held informally under the crown, was at his sister's side ready to inflame any prejudices which may have already existed in her mind and urge an adoption of the most violent courses.

None the less, there can exist no doubt that the whole expedition was primarily the work of Mary, and that outside

instigation had little to do with it. She entered upon the undertaking with the utmost zest, and from first to last pursued Huntly with the ferocity of a tigress. In the words of the English ambassador, Randolph, who accompanied this royal progress and is the determining authority upon it, 'she is utterly determined to bring him to utter confusion.'

Upon arriving at Aberdeen, the Queen refused to visit her own Chancellor, though his castle of Strathbogie was but three miles distant. This incident alone must have enabled Huntly to see what was in store for him. Mary then made a westward circuit through her dominions, and on the governor of Inverness Castle hesitating in regard to the delivery of the keys, hanged him on the day following. Though a servant of Huntly's, he had received no orders from his master, and as the garrison consisted only of twelve men, the severity of the sentence could again be taken as another indication of the blowing of the wind.

Upon returning to Aberdeen, Lord James Stuart (or Mar, as he had then become) was invested with the earldom of Moray. From Huntly, Mary demanded the surrender of a cannon, and upon his Countess beseeching her for grace in the name of their common religion, laughed at her entreaties. Upon the keys of two castles being sent to her by a Gordon messenger, the Queen merely said that 'she had provided other means to open these doors.'

That Huntly long ere this should have been entirely at his wits' end is not surprising. He was absolutely between the 'devil and the deep sea.' There was no safety for him either in surrender or resistance. Finally, goaded to desperation, he took up arms, and at Corrichie Burn ended the chapter of his calamities by falling off his horse, apparently in a fit of apoplexy, 'stark dead, without word that ever he spoke.'

The wholly unnecessary presence of the Queen at the execution of Sir John Gordon, which followed upon the day after, was a barbarous proceeding, and one over which her admirers must be only too willing to draw a veil. It seems to have been prompted by no other motive than a desire to gloat over his sufferings, and the contention of her apologists that she was merely obeying the commands of Moray rests upon no evidence. When her brother strove to the uttermost to hinder the Darnley marriage, he was speedily shewn

by Mary that she only complied with his behests when it suited her own convenience. The charge that Sir John Gordon was intended as a bridegroom for the Queen is in itself preposterous, and cannot be seriously entertained. He was a younger son, already married and of no reputation, and that such a personage should have been deemed a fitting consort for a princess at whose feet well-nigh half the crowned heads of Europe were sighing, is to accuse his father of a fatuity of mind for which there is no warrant.

It has been conjectured that a secret understanding existed between Huntly and the Guises, and Mary herself in a letter to the Cardinal of Lorraine displays a consciousness that the matter was one which demanded an apology. 'Make my excuses,' she therein says, 'if I have failed in any part of my duty towards religion.' The epistle to the Duke of Guise upon the whole affair—which could hardly have failed to prove illuminating—was, Mr. Andrew Lang tells us, unfortunately burned in a fire at the premises of the binder to the British Museum.

The obscuring of the issues involved in the Huntly episode has been created almost entirely by the implacable animosity cherished towards Mary by Knox and Buchanan. Nothing that she could do was right in their eyes. The destruction of one who, in the language of the former, was a 'proud mocker,' a 'maintainer of idolatry,' and a 'hinderer of good works' might, from their standpoint at least, have been accounted unto her for righteousness, but so far from this being the case they have set themselves to manufacture imaginary evidence of an agreement between Huntly and the Queen which is absolutely belied by the historical chapter of events. To have allowed Mary any credit for the suppression of Popery would have been an admission of grace absolutely repugnant to them. The whole of Knox's statements as to the Queen 'having glowmed' at the news of Corrichie and so forth are in direct antagonism to those of Randolph, and may safely be dismissed as perfectly untrustworthy.

The real puzzle that demands elucidation in the relations of Mary to the house of Gordon, lies however less in her destruction of it in 1562 than in her restoration of it in 1565. Historians have with singular unanimity scrupulously refrained from dealing with this aspect of the question. Assuming, in accordance with the rigour of the proceedings taken against

them, that the Gordons were a species of viper's brood worthy only of being cut off in Old Testament fashion, the difficulty which then arises is to discover a justification of the grounds upon which they were let loose upon a regenerated Scotland only three years after their downfall.

So far as Huntly's eldest son was concerned, there is nothing to show that he possessed any claim whatsoever upon the royal clemency. At the time of the Corrichie affair, he seems to have been in the house of his father-in-law, Chatelherault, engaged on a futile mission to procure the aid of the Hamiltons for his distressed family. Prior to the arrival of the body of his father before the bar at Edinburgh in order to have an act of forfeiture and attainder passed upon it, the younger Huntly had been dragged to the capital and there condemned to death. Subsequently, without any reason assigned, he was removed to Dunbar Castle, and allowed to languish there—no attempt at the fulfilment of his sentence having been made.

It has been said of Mary that she kept Bothwell as a catapult with which to attack her enemies, and the remark applies to Huntly with equal felicity. For aught she cared the chief of the Gordons might have been allowed to rot undisturbed in his dungeon, had not contingencies arisen which rendered his help a political necessity. The son of the man whom she had just branded as a traitor, was only held up as a reserve card that could be safely played when occasion demanded, and with the rebellion of Moray the need for his introduction upon the scene arose.

During the Roundabout Raid, Huntly was entrusted with the command of the rearguard of the royal army and lost no opportunity of furthering the interests of his mistress in the intrigues that followed.

Escaping along with Bothwell from Holyrood on the night of the Rizzio murder, he joined him in raising the royal standard and discomfiting the framers of that sinister conspiracy. It was due only to Huntly's remoteness from the scene of action, and to no fault of his own, that he was not to the fore at Carberry Hill and Langside. In both instances he was hurrying down with all the forces at his command as rapidly as the difficulties of transportation admitted.

After the flight of Mary to England, Huntly summoned a convention which met at Largs, and would, with the assistance

of the Hamiltons and the Bordours, have crushed Moray before he had time to assemble a Parliament, had not an order arrived from the Queen commanding the disbandment of the royal troops; the ever-present mirage of the English succession thus luring its victim to a final and irretrievable blunder. Huntly continued to act as Lieutenant-Governor of Scotland under the captive Queen's mandate until 1572, when, recognizing the hopelessness of the cause committed to him, he made terms with Morton. His younger brother Adam, whose life too had been spared after Corrichie, even then reluctantly suspended his military operations, and vowed that it was still possible to reduce the country to obedience.

The devotion of the Gordons to the woman who, in the most cold-blooded of fashions, had shed their father's blood, is indeed truly amazing. Hardly ever did they fail to heap coals of fire upon her head. The fidelity of the sons is the most effective of answers to the charges of disloyalty brought against the father. So far as the question of heredity is concerned, the younger Huntly walked closely in the paternal footsteps. It cannot be denied that a certain shiftiness always characterized the dealings of the house of Gordon, but none the less they were invariably true in the end to their reactionary instincts.

At no period in the subsequent developments of Scottish history did the house of Huntly fail the Stuart cause. The grandson of Mary's lieutenant-general laid down his head on the block for Charles I. in 1646; another descendant kept the Jacobite flag flying over Edinburgh Castle in 1689 until the arrival of the news of Killiecrankie; in 1715 the son of the friend of Claverhouse fought for the old Pretender at Sheriffmuir; and in the '45' Lord Lewie Gordon—of Jacobite lyrical fame—assisted the young Chevalier with the connivance of his brother.

Had Mary Stuart at the date of her first appearance upon Scottish shores landed at Aberdeen and flung in her lot with Huntly, she would doubtless have found him as staunch to his allegiance as all of his descendants proved to theirs, but despite her undying fascination she was true neither to the cause of religion nor of country, and a disposition to trust enemies rather than friends was the most deeply-rooted weakness in her character.

It has been alleged that Mary's behaviour to the various Scottish political leaders was regulated by secret instructions from

her mother, and that in this fashion she had been warned against Huntly, but on her death-bed the Regent asked that the chief of the Gordons should be included in a deputation to be sent to her. Her request, however, was not complied with. It is significant also that Bothwell, who above all others was entitled to a favourable reception at the hands of the daughter of Mary of Lorraine, was at first accorded one of the very coldest.

If the testimony of the chroniclers of his own family can be trusted, Huntly was a man of many accomplishments, and much given to frequenting the court of France. Had he been contented to renounce his Catholicism, despoil the church, and act consistently with the Lords of the Congregation, his supremacy in the north would in all probability have been allowed to remain unquestioned. To quote the words of Lady Huntly, 'would he have forsaken God and his religion as those that are now about the Queen, my husband would never have been put at as he now is.'

'How playnely, sincerely and uprightly he has been accustomed to deal,' are the words concerning Huntly, not of a Popish partisan, but of Maitland, one of his worst and most dangerous political adversaries.

THOMAS DUNCAN.

## Scandinavian Ballads on Caithness Soldiers

IN an earlier number of this review<sup>1</sup> Mr. A. Francis Steuart gave an interesting account of the exploits of certain Scottish officers in Sweden, and the eighteenth century ballads, with which this paper deals, relate to two soldiers, who took service under those most famous Swedish monarchs, Gustavus Adolphus and Charles XII. The stirring poem of the Norwegian, *Storm*, is concerned with the massacre of Captain George Sinclair and his force at Kringelen by the Norse dalesmen in 1612, and may be described as a paean of triumph over the discomfiture of the Scots; whilst the lament for Major Malcolm Sinclair, which the Swedish poet, Odel, published soon after the envoy's brutal assassination by order of the Russian Court at Naumburg in Silesia in 1739, is laudatory of its subject, and was obviously written for the express purpose of calling down vengeance on the murderers. These ballads are not merely of historical interest; they belong to the patriotic poetry of their respective countries. Norwegian children still recite *Storm*'s verses, and Malcolm Sinclair is still regarded by the Swedes as one of their national heroes.

The most authentic account of the Scottish expedition to Norway in the seventeenth century is given by Mr. Thomas Michell, C.B., who was most careful to sift fiction from fact, and examined a number of historical documents on record in London, Edinburgh, Stockholm and Copenhagen.<sup>2</sup> The Calmar

<sup>1</sup> *S.H.R.* vol. i. page 191, January 1904.

<sup>2</sup> Published in London and Christiania, 1886. The author was H.M. Consul-General for Norway, and the volume was the outcome of a lecture delivered at the University of Christiania before H.M. the King of Sweden and Norway.

## Scandinavian Ballads on Caithness Soldiers 375

War between Denmark and Sweden lasted from the spring of 1611 to the winter of 1613. Norway was then annexed to the Crown of Denmark, which was ruled by Christian IV., and Gustavus Adolphus, who at the age of seventeen succeeded his father, Charles IX. of Sweden, just after the beginning of the war, was active in obtaining foreign levies from the Netherlands, England and Scotland. Two expeditions marched through Norway. This route was essential, as the Danes had the command of the Skager Rack, and held two important fortresses in Gothland, Elfsborg and Gullberg. The first contingent under the Swedish colonel, Johan Munkhaven or Mönnichhofen, who sailed from Amsterdam with about 1200 troops, reached its destination in safety; but the second detachment, which was led by Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander Ramsay, and not by Captain George Sinclair,<sup>1</sup> as tradition has it, met with disaster.

Colonel Andrew Ramsay, brother of the defeated leader at Kringelen, was active in levying the Scottish forces, although the commission of Gustavus dated November 1611, urging the despatch of the mercenaries, as promised to his father, is addressed to Sir James Spens, James's envoy in Sweden. In Denmark the English king was suspected of knowledge of these proceedings, but he does not seem to have been aware of what Ramsay was doing until the end of July 1612, when he ordered the Scottish Privy Council to make inquiry. They excused themselves on the ground that the levies had been made secretly, but James was not satisfied, and informed his envoy at Copenhagen that he had let them know how much he disliked their 'dullness,' and assured him of his goodwill to his brother-in-law, Christian.<sup>2</sup> Various proclamations were issued against the transporting of soldiers to Sweden, and a charge was preferred against certain officers of going about the country in a 'swaggering manner' and pressing his majesty's subjects on board ship.<sup>3</sup> Andrew Ramsay was summoned before

<sup>1</sup>This is apparent from the despatch of Sir Robert Anstruther, Ambassador at Copenhagen to James VI., dated 26th October, 1612. Sinclair was a nephew of George, fifth Earl of Caithness. See *Caithness Family History*, by John Henderson, W.S., 1884, p. 6.

<sup>2</sup>King to Sir Robert Anstruther, 16th Sept., 1612.

<sup>3</sup>Extracts from the Register of the Privy Council of Scotland, 1612, Gen. Reg. Ho. Edin.

the Council, but failed to appear. He was declared rebel, and put to the horn.

But these measures did not prevent a small body of the Scottish levies from reaching Norway. Between the 19th and 20th August, 1612, two ships arrived at Romsdal with 300 troops under Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander Ramsay, Captain George Hay and Captain George Sinclair. The junior officers set sail from Caithness, whilst Ramsay embarked at Dundee. From Romsdal they advanced with two guides over the Dovre Field into the valley of Gudbrandsdal, the Bönder or peasant proprietors retreating before them. The Norwegians, who were 405 men strong and were concealed in the wooded heights under two civilians, Lauritz Hage and Peder Rankleff, attacked and annihilated the Scots at Kringelen on 26th August, as they were marching along a narrow bridle path on the other side of which ran the river Laugen. The prisoners, numbering 134, were confined in a small barn and, with the exception of 18 including Ramsay, Captain Bruce, James Moneypenny and James Scott, were all shot or cut down the day after the fight. The enemy lost only six men, and ten or twelve wounded. The State Archives at Copenhagen contain two official reports, dated respectively the 17th September and the 3rd October, from the Norwegian Stadholder, Envold Kruse to the Danish Chancellor, giving particulars of the destruction of the Scots.

What was the cause of this disastrous rout? The fact that the Scots were taken unawares does not excuse them for not having taken proper precautions in a hostile country. But after an examination of the ground, and having made the most minute mathematical calculations, Mr. Michell's theory is that the traditional hurling down of rocks or 'tömmervaelte' from the precipitous sides of the mountain will not alone account for it. It is likely that only the Caithness men were armed and that a considerable number of the Scottish force consisted of pressed men, who, having been hurried out of the country, had not been properly equipped. Their defeat, therefore, became an easy matter for the Bönder, having regard to the awkward position in which they found themselves and their ignorance of the locality. Alexander Ramsay and his three companions were sent to Denmark, and afterwards to Scotland, to be dealt with by James. They escaped punishment, but Colonel Andrew Ramsay was banished the realm.

## Scandinavian Ballads on Caithness Soldiers 377

Around this episode has grown a mass of tradition. The subject has been treated poetically,<sup>1</sup> as drama,<sup>2</sup> in fiction<sup>3</sup> and in art.<sup>4</sup> There is a legend that Sinclair encountered an island woman in Romsdal fiord, who foretold disaster, and this prophetess of evil is transformed into a mermaid in Storm's ballad. The poet thus describes his voyage and landing in Norway:

He sailed a day, he sailéd three,  
With all his mercenary band ;  
The fourth he Norway's shore did see.  
On Romsdal's coast he leapt to land,  
And with him fourteen hundred men :  
On mischief all that band was bent ;  
They spared nor young nor aged then,  
But slew and burnt as on they went.  
The child they killed at mother's breast,  
Nor cared how sweet so'er its smile ;  
Of widows' tears they made a jest,  
Sorrow's loud cry arose the while.

In this passage the numbers of the Scots are greatly exaggerated, and the accusations against them, which are repeated in other Norwegian Sagas, have no foundation in fact. Like the Covenanting chronicler, Wodrow, who also wrote many years after the event, Storm was tempted to embellish his narrative with much picturesque fiction. Envold Kruse, in his report of 3rd October, 1612, to the Danish government already referred to, expressly states: 'We have also since ascertained that those Scots, who were defeated and captured on their march through this country have absolutely neither burned, murdered nor destroyed anything on their march through this country either in Romsdalen or in Gudbrandsdalen.' And so precise is he on this point that he says the Bönder denied having found a silver chest

<sup>1</sup> *The Sinclair Ballad*, by E. Storm, 1782, and *Poems from John o' Groats, The Soldier's Bride*, by J. T. Calder, Wick, 1855.

<sup>2</sup> *The Scottish War or The Bonde Wedding in Gudbrandsdalen*, a play, by K. L. Rahbek, Copenhagen, 1810; and *Sinclair's Death*, a tragedy, by H. Wergeland, Christiania, 1826.

<sup>3</sup> *The Scottish Expedition or The Battle of Kringen*, a two volume novel, by J. St. Wang, Christiania, 1836.

<sup>4</sup> *The Landing in Romsdalen*, by Gude & Tiedemann, and other paintings by Norwegian artists. The writer recollects, when he visited the Industrial Exhibition at Bergen in 1898, seeing a large canvas on the walls, which represented the massacre, deplorable as a work of art, yet interesting as evidence that the event is still celebrated.

which one Sören Setnaes, a Dane, alleged the Scottish mercenaries had taken from him.

There is a story that a treacherous guide, who pretended to be a friendly Swede, led them into the trap, and that a peasant girl, Guri, stood on the mountain top and signalled to the concealed Bönder the approach of the enemy by blowing on a cow-horn. The Scots are said to have stopped for a moment to listen to the weird strains and to have replied by playing a march. Sinclair was apparently known to the Norwegians by reputation, for he was supposed to possess a charmed life, and was killed by Berdon Segelstad with a silver button which he tore from his shirt. The inscription over his grave asserts that the enemy, who numbered 900, were 'crushed like earthen pots by a smaller number of 300 Bönder,' but these figures, as has been shown, are inaccurate. Calder, on the authority of Laing, recalls the tradition that Sinclair's wife accompanied him on the expedition, and that after the death of her husband she, mistaking his intention, shot dead a young Norwegian who had come to her assistance.<sup>1</sup> The entry in the parish register of Vaage made in 1731 states that Mrs. Sinclair survived, but another account has it that she was shot down and drowned in the Laugen. Storm is also in error in saying that none of the enemy returned home. The spirited conclusion of his ballad is a just tribute to the presence of mind and ingenuity of his countrymen, but to regard this 'little war' as a second Thermopylae is to lose sense of proportion :

'Mid Norway's mountains still there stands  
A column raised upon the spot:  
Let Norway's foes from other lands  
Behold it, and despise it not.  
No Norseman sees it rise on high  
But marks it with a flashing eye.'

The author of the *Domestic Annals of Scotland* (1859) speaks somewhat contemptuously of this 'vaunting ballad,'<sup>2</sup> and of the celebration of this event by the Norwegians in his day as a

<sup>1</sup> *History of Caithness*, 1861, p. 126.

<sup>2</sup> Edvard Storm (1742-1794) was born at Vaage in Gudbrandsdal and died at Copenhagen. He published his poem in the *Dansk Museum*, a Norwegian periodical, in 1782. This translation is taken from *Over the Dovre Fjeld*, by J. S. Shepherd, 1873. Other versions will be found in Calder's *History of Caithness* and Grant's *Scottish Soldiers of Fortune*. The ballad has been translated into German, and set to music in Norway.

## Scandinavian Ballads on Caithness Soldiers 379

glorious achievement, and it cannot be said that it is creditable to the Bönder. And yet it is only fair to add in extenuation of their cruelty that earlier in the year certain Norwegian captives had been mercilessly shot down by the Swedes under Colonel Kruus at the taking of Nylödelse.

But if the importance of this episode has been exaggerated in Norwegian history, the assassination of Major Malcolm Sinclair by the Russians in 1739 was a political crime of supreme moment, which aroused sympathetic interest in Scotland, and the effect of which was felt by the Swedes after his death. In 1709, when in his eighteenth year, he was captured at the disastrous Battle of Pultawa, where Peter the Great defeated Charles XII., and he languished in Siberia for thirteen years. The circumstances attending Sinclair's murder are narrated in Scandinavian and other histories, and it seems to be agreed that it was the primary cause of the war which broke out between Sweden and Russia in August 1741. The best summary of the political situation is contained in Carlyle's *Friedrich II.*: 'The Swedes declare War. Will recover their lost portions of Finland etc., etc. They had long been meditating it; they had Turk negotiations going on, diligent emissaries to the Turk (a certain Major Sinclair for one whom the Russians waylaid and assassinated to get sight of his Papers) during the late Turk-Russian War; but could conclude nothing while that was in activity, concluded only after that was done, striking the iron when grown cold. A chief point in their Manifesto was the assassination of this Sinclair; scandal and atrocity of which there is no doubt the Russians were guilty.' And he adds with characteristic precision that the murder was 'done by four Russian subalterns 2 miles from Naumburg in Silesia, 17 June, 1739, about 7 P.M.'

At this date Frederick I. was King of Sweden, and the Empress Anne sat on the Russian throne. She was a vulgar woman, who delighted in the society of low favourites, and it was one of them, a Courlander named Biren, said to have been the son of a groom, who planned Sinclair's murder.<sup>1</sup> Bestucheff, according to Baron Mannstein, was then the Russian minister at Stockholm, and he gave notice to his court that a Swedish envoy had been sent to Constantinople to conclude a treaty with Turkey. The Russians at once dispatched several officers

<sup>1</sup> *Russia*, by W. R. Morfill, M.A., 1890, p. 191.

into Poland, who employed certain Jews and others to watch for Sinclair on his return. The latter proposed to pass through Lemberg in Galicia, but he was warned by the friendly Governor of Chockzine in Bessarabia that the Russians were on the lookout for him near this place. He changed his route and entered Silesia with an escort, which had been furnished to him by the Crown-General of Poland. Here he imagined himself safe, and he stopped for a few days at Breslau. But his enemies, having learned by means of spies the route which he had taken, pursued and overtook him near Naumburg, which lies due west of Breslau on the Queiss, a tributary of the Oder. After the assassination the miscreants removed the clothes and papers from the body. It is stated in the *Biographie Universelle* (Paris, 1825, vol. xlii. p. 413) that the news of this atrocious deed was brought to Sweden by a Frenchman, named Couturier, who apparently was Sinclair's only companion and miraculously escaped a similar fate.

In the Swedish capital the rage of the populace knew no bounds.<sup>1</sup> They wrecked the house of the Russian ambassador, crying out that they were 'inspired by the soul of Sinclair.' The Russian Court made a pretence of banishing Lieutenant Kuthler and five of his accomplices to Siberia in order to disarm suspicion, but they were soon recalled and reinstated.

Under the heading of Public Affairs there is an interesting item in the *Scots Magazine* for January 1740 :

'After the death of Major Sinclair affairs at Stockholm seemed to be greatly perplexed. The reader may not be displeased in this place with the inscription which his Swedish Majesty has caused to be written upon the tomb of the unfortunate Sinclair in the Church of St. Nicholas in Stralsund :

Here lies Major MALCOMB SINCLAIR a good and faithful subject of the kingdom of Sweden born in 1691 son of the most worthy Major-General Sinclair and Madam de Hamilton. The events of his life were very singular and remarkable. He was prisoner of war in Siberia from the year 1709 to 1722. Being charged with a commission to execute some affairs of state he was on the 17th June 1739 in an execrable manner assassinated near Naumbourg in Silesia. Reader, drop some tears

<sup>1</sup> The War of Jenkins' Ear in this same year, 1739, is another instance illustrating the willingness of the people in those days to take upon themselves the task of avenging any outrage inflicted on a fellow citizen. This English captain is said to have been tortured and to have had his ears cut off by the Spaniards in the colonies. Owing to the popular clamour, Walpole was compelled against his will to declare war against Spain. *History of Modern Europe*, by Richard Lodge, M.A., 1893, p. 337.

## Scandinavian Ballads on Caithness Soldiers 381

upon this tomb and consider with thyself how incomprehensible are the destinies of poor mortals.

The house of M. Bestuchef, the Russian Minister at Stockholm, has lately been violently assaulted by a mob, who committed several outrages.'

This incident is commemorated in a poem of ninety stanzas by Anders Odel entitled *Sinclair's Visa*, which was published in the year of his death. The last edition was printed at Westerock in 1877; the introduction states that Odel (1718-1773) was at one time Director of the Chamber of Industry and a writer on politics as well as a poet. The ballad contains many fine descriptive passages, and it soon became known all over the country and electrified the minds of the people. Its poetical value can only be fully appreciated by those acquainted with the language, but its importance as a political pamphlet may be readily understood in a translation.<sup>1</sup> From this point of view it is difficult to exaggerate its historical significance. The author, throughout, is apparently striving to inflame his readers with hatred of Russia, and in one passage he expresses his joy that it is not too late for Heaven to revenge.

The story is related by the shepherd Celadon, who is conducted by an old grey-haired man to the Elysian Fields and overhears a conversation between the departed hero and the Swedish kings.<sup>2</sup> Entering a mountain, the travellers behold a wonderful prospect, valleys strewn with lilies, crystal streams flowing from the hills, cypress groves and uplands on which the cedars grow. The sky is clear as sapphire and the music of silver-tongued birds fills the air with melody. There lies before them a beautiful garden, 'a masterpiece of Flora,' which contains a weeping fountain, and the old man explains that it has been there since Charles XII. died. Celadon wishes to remain in this pleasant place, but his companion hurries him on, until they come to a castle, where in a dimly-lighted hall

<sup>1</sup> I am much indebted to Dr. C. Anders Ryman for his kindness in procuring a copy of this remarkable folk-song from the Royal Library in Stockholm and translating it for me. It is now out of print.

<sup>2</sup> In the seventeenth century a certain Professor Olaus Rudbeck, of Upsal University, asserted that the ancient Greeks had derived their ideas of the Gardens of the Hesperides, the Fortunate Isles and the Elysian Fields from Sweden, which was once an appendage of Germany. This is of course mere conjecture, and the historian Gibbon, who refers to Rudbeck's treatise, is naturally sceptical, but Odel as a patriotic Swede doubtless took advantage of this popular notion and selected his theme accordingly. See *The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, edit. 1897, vol. i. p. 217.

the twelve Karls of Sweden are seated round a silver table. The characteristics of each monarch are described in detail, but those of the last and most famous of the line need alone concern us. 'He was a suave, tall, and well-made hero; one could see that he never knew what fear was; his eyes were as keen as a young eagle's, his hard fists were knitted like bear's paws, and his hair was short from the crown; his arms and legs were full of muscle, and his shoulders and loins were strong as marble. He was clad in a Swedish coat of blue cloth braided with elk-skin and he wore long gloves. Round his waist he had a broad belt and attached thereto a dreadful sword, which many had seen him wield to good effect.' Charles is pacing the hall when he hears a noise without, and he stands still and listens, wondering what stranger can be coming to the silent Chamber of Death. The ghostly guard of honour sharply presents arms, and Malcolm enters.

The apparition of Sinclair as, covered with blood, he stands before the Swedish king, recalls that of Banquo when he confronted Macbeth 'with twenty trenched gashes on its head.' The mysterious visitor salutes in Swedish fashion, and Charles XII. says to him: 'We do not know you. Who may you be?' Sinclair briefly states his name and rank and how he has just been murdered. But when he mentions his errand to the Sultan, who, it will be remembered, had befriended Charles at Bender after his escape from Pultawa, his interrogator gets strangely agitated and calls upon the other kings to pay particular attention. The major is summoned to the table, has to give a detailed account of his own assassination,<sup>1</sup> and is cross-examined by Charles as to the intentions of the Kaiser regarding Sweden, the progress of the Russo-Turkish war and the relations existing between Queen Ulrika, Charles's sister, and her husband Frederick I., to whom she had weakly handed over the reins of government. Then certain plenipotentiaries of the nether world appear, and are received in audience by Charles, and Celadon can see that the new-comer to Hades is the subject of respectful sympathy.

After their departure his Swedish Majesty takes Sinclair by the hand, and, engaged in earnest conversation, they traverse

<sup>1</sup> According to Odel, Sinclair was set upon by six dragoons, who, on his refusal to answer their questions and deliver up his papers, dragged him from his carriage and shot him through the head. Kuthler is mentioned as one of the assassins.

the lawn outside the castle. When they return, Charles XI. says: 'What ails thee, my son? thou seemest much excited.' To which the other replies, 'Oh, it is nothing, my father, I am just about to return to earth, where I intend to marshal my troops and deliver a blow that will stagger Europe. Come, Sinclair, come with me, we will splinter steel like rotten wood, and bend the stubborn necks!' Sinclair, nothing loth, is ready to accompany his leader, when Charles XI. seizes hold of his son's coat, reminds him that he belongs to the ranks of the dead, and persuades him to remain. Then follows a panegyric by the hero of Narva on his soldiers, 'his brave blue men,' with reference to the magnificent record of Swedish conquest in the past. Finally, all traces of his wounds and sufferings having disappeared, Sinclair becomes a 'new man,' and is conducted to a splendid chamber set with pearls, where he meets other fallen warriors, who greet him with joy and embrace him affectionately. The old man then leads Celadon back to his sheep, which are feeding on the same spot where he had left them, and the shepherd, after watching his companion out of sight, sits down and sheds tears for Sinclair. The last word is addressed to all patriotic Swedes, who are bidden to reflect on such a cruel crime, to remember the authors of it and to avenge the blood of Malcolm Sinclair, who, when he might have purchased safety by the betrayal of his country's secrets, preferred to keep silence.

In 1877 a correspondent of the Swedish newspaper *Kalmar*, writing from Öland, pointed out that the Sinclair ballad was at that date still sung by the peasantry of the island. In every village of Öland there was an official called the 'Byordningsman,' whose duty was to keep a copy of the song with the parish records in a strong box. The choice of a new custodian was attended with certain ceremonies, when the villagers were called together and held a feast. After the choice was made, and everyone had taken his seat at the feast, the precious document was produced and handed round. Every peasant had to sing one stanza in a loud voice to the correct tune. If he could not sing at all, he had to hire someone to take his place; and if he tried to avoid this outlay and made a bad attempt, he was immediately stopped and had to pay a fine, which went to the village fund towards the next year's festivity. In this way the whole song, consisting of ninety stanzas, was sung to the end.

GEORGE A. SINCLAIR.

## Burnet on the Scottish Troubles<sup>1</sup>

SCOTTISH history, almost proverbially, is the Slough of Despond of the scientific historian. Frequently the past he would resurrect has left but faint and confused echoes of its passage ; and it is well if the interest of difficulty can buoy his hope to the end. But documents in plenty may be no cause for gratitude. Strife and intrigue are their subject-matter. Faith in the powers of research and historic truth finds but cold comfort in their distortions and caricatures.

One of these characteristic records of a characteristic age in Scottish history is *The Memoirs of James and William,<sup>2</sup> Dukes of Hamilton*, by Gilbert Burnet. Published in 1677, it professes, among other things, to give 'an Account . . . of the Rise and Progress of the Civil Wars of Scotland.'<sup>3</sup> Of the seven books which constitute the volume, the first and the last are outwith my survey : the former is chiefly concerned with the German campaign of James, Marquis Hamilton ; the latter is a somewhat cursory account of the years between his death and that of his brother at Worcester. The remainder (of which I treat) is, in the first place, the story of James, first Duke Hamilton, as a figure in Scottish history : in the fullest interpretation, it is the history of the Bishops' Wars and of Scotland's share in the English Civil War.

The starting-point for criticism is determined by comparison of the title-page with the dedication to Charles II. and with the licence to print that succeed it. The title-page is dated 1677, the dedication 21st October, and the licence 3rd November, 1673.<sup>4</sup> The explanation of this discrepancy involves the history

<sup>1</sup> Rearrangement of a paper read before Glas. Univ. Hist. Soc., Jan. 1906.

<sup>2</sup> The life of William, second Duke Hamilton, is related only in so far as it affects his brother.

<sup>3</sup> *v.* title-page (ed. 1677).

<sup>4</sup> I use throughout the first edition, 1677. The Clar. Press reprint, 1852, inserts the original pagination in the margin.

of the composition and publication of the *Memoirs*, and reveals interesting and important facts for an estimate of its value.

In 1673 Burnet was Divinity professor in Glasgow University. Scotland for some five years had been administered by the Lauderdale of the *Memoirs*, whose high-handed control had excited much discontent over monopolies, over other civil injustices, and (as usual) over religion. It was in the summer of this year that Burnet went up to Court to arrange the publication of his *Memoirs*. He was against the Lauderdale administration; and he went up with the resolution 'to deal very plainly with the duke'<sup>1</sup> in the interests of his country; but his advice effected nothing, though great offers were made to induce him to change his party. Through Lauderdale, probably with a view to this desirable conversion, Burnet was introduced at Court; and the duke proposed to Charles the licensing the *Memoirs*. Delays followed 'because the King and many of the ministers were desirous to read them in Manuscript.'<sup>2</sup> But Coventry signed the necessary licence on November 3rd.

Meanwhile Burnet had gained in favour with the King. Through Lord Ancram he had become familiar with the Duke of York; and his intimacy with the Duke excited the jealousy of the Lauderdale, who set up to be the only medium to court favour. A parliament had been determined on in Scotland, and Burnet's inability to go north with Lauderdale proved an additional incentive to this jealousy. Burnet, however, promised to leave as soon as he had obtained the desired licence; and he 'unhappily got to Edinburgh the night before the parliament met.'<sup>3</sup> There he learnt from Hamilton and others the evil reports Lauderdale had spread regarding his intimacy with the prince, and was informed also of the attack intended next day in parliament on the royal minister. Next day (12th November) parliament opened its fourth session. Lauderdale's request of a grant for the Dutch war was met by a motion from Hamilton, that the grievances of the country be discussed first. Parliament had to be prorogued; but the action was proof rather of Lauderdale's weakness than of his power in Scotland. His persistent action in the interests of the royal prerogative preserved him in the King's favour; but he had to explain his virtual failure,

<sup>1</sup> O.T. (ed. Airy), ii. 25.

<sup>2</sup> Life (in O.T. ed. 1724-34), ii. 683.

<sup>3</sup> O.T. ii. 38.

and he laid the blame on Burnet. He remembered how Burnet had warned him beforehand of what had now happened ; he recalled Burnet's credit at Court, the haste of his journey north, his arrival so exactly the night before parliament should meet ; and from the sum of these coincidences he deduced, in his disappointment and displeasure, that Burnet had been 'sent upon design, as the agent of the party, and that the licensing [his] book was only a blind.'<sup>1</sup> The result was that by December, 1673, Burnet was out of favour with both Charles and the Duke of York.<sup>2</sup> By the summer of 1674 the prince was again somewhat friendly, but Charles and Lauderdale remained hostile—the latter so much so that Burnet chose to resign his chair rather than return to Scotland. He refused to give up Hamilton or to reveal secrets towards a reconciliation ; and he grew into such disfavour with the King that finally he was banished the Court. So the quarrel persisted, till Burnet is summoned by the English Commons to give evidence against Lauderdale—on 23rd April, 1675. Even after the publication of the *Memoirs* Lauderdale remained unappeased ; on one occasion we find him urging Sir John Cotton to refuse Burnet the use of his library for research.

This piece of Burnet's personal history offers the most likely, if not the correct, explanation of the discrepancy between the dates of the first title-page and of the licence. In his dedication Burnet had referred to the loyalty of the then Duke of Hamilton. Within less than a month the Duke was leader of an opposition to the royal minister in parliament, and Burnet was ranged with him, under suspicion. The licence was granted on November 3rd. The outcome of November 12th was Burnet's loss of royal favour. Moreover, this would affect the publication even more than usual. Charles' licence was an essential preliminary, but the King had generously promised that the book 'should be printed at his charge.'<sup>3</sup>

These matters concern only the publication ; the details of the composition are equally important. Burnet declared of the *Memoirs* that he 'got through that work in a few months.'<sup>4</sup> But this, if true, can apply only to the period of throwing his results into book-form. The preface, as it exists in MS.,<sup>5</sup> is very different from that prefixed to the first edition. It contains

<sup>1</sup> O.T. ii. 39. <sup>2</sup> Lauderdale Papers (Cam. Soc.), iii, 10. <sup>3</sup> O.T. ii. 37.

<sup>4</sup> O.T. i. 532-3. <sup>5</sup> Brit. Mus. Add. MS. 33-259.

a statement of the method Burnet pursued; and we learn that he requested, and was promised, the use of the Hamilton papers, after which he was 'some considerable time'<sup>1</sup> hunting up all the calumnies that had been heaped on the Duke, that he might the better scrutinise his sources when they arrived. 'But,' he continues, 'judging it unfit for me to force myself upon so great a trust as was the use of all his papers, I still waited when any of their graces [the then Duke and Duchess] should have put new life in that motion, which seemed almost dead. I confess their silence made me apprehend that a nearer knowledge of me had discovered my too apparent deserts so clearly to them, that they had repented their first forwardness of entertaining my proposition, and this constrained me to a longer reserve.'<sup>2</sup> At last, however, he ventured to remind the Hamiltons of their promise. 'Their graces,' it seems, had also hesitated, unwilling to force upon Burnet so large a task as they knew the *Memoirs* must prove. The number and disorder of the papers was great. 'Yet at length patience and diligence overcame the tediousness of the task,'<sup>3</sup> and Burnet found he had materials for a larger work than he had contemplated. Clearly the preparation of his subject occupied some time, however rapidly the results may have been put together. Duke Hamilton, it may be noticed, complained to Turner of 'Mr. Burnet's precipitant haste,' giving rise to many errors in his book. He even made some attempt to check Burnet, with the result that for a time correspondence between them ceased.<sup>4</sup>

'At first,' it seems, '[Burnet] wrote this work Historically, and only drew the most material heads and passages out of the Papers that lay before [him].' But Sir Robert Murray persuaded him to rewrite it, inserting 'most of the Papers at their full length'.<sup>5</sup> It was this second MS. that Burnet carried with him to Court in the summer of 1673; and it is this MS., part of which is preserved to-day.

Arrived at Court, as already stated, the MS. was read by King Charles II. and by 'many of his ministers'—among whom, no doubt, was Lauderdale.<sup>6</sup> The MS. bears the marks of its passage through their hands. At places additions are indicated

<sup>1</sup> MS. 7.      <sup>2</sup> MS. 7-8.      <sup>3</sup> MS. 8.

<sup>4</sup> v. Turner's *Memoirs* (Bann. Club), App. ii. 254.

<sup>5</sup> *Memoirs*, p. [ix.]. For Murray's opinion of the *Memoirs*, see O.T. i. 41.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. O.T. i. 533.

or inserted in the margin ; at other places whole passages have been deleted. The corrections are all in Burnet's autograph.

Conspicuous among deletions are references to Lauderdale. In one case the omission is justified, the passage containing error of fact.<sup>1</sup> But in the others explanation is harder to seek. Thus, when in 1641 Loudon was advanced to the Chancellorship, we are informed that many resented the appointment, in particular Lauderdale, who retired in consequence.<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to see why such a reference should be dropped, unless we ascribe it to the influence of Lauderdale himself. More important deletions I shall refer to later—deletions so vital as to deserve the stronger title of suppressions.

Of additions in the MS., some are notes to insert letters or documents at length ; others are more significant, since they can be ascribed only to the circulation of the MS. at Court. Burnet supplemented his documents by the information of 'Persons of great Honour and Worth.'<sup>3</sup> Invariably the references to such are additions in the original MS. Clearly this information was the revision of Burnet's book by Charles and his ministers, for it is noteworthy that—with very few, if any important, exceptions—his informants are prominent members of the Court, or of the royalist persuasion. Such facts prepare us for the confession in the *History of my own Times* : 'I saw a great deal more among the papers of the Dukes of Hamilton than was properly a part of their Memoirs, or fit to be told at that time : for when a licence was to be obtained, and a work was to be published fit for that family to own, things foreign to their ministry, or hurtful to any other families, were not to be intermixed with the account I then gave of the late wars.'<sup>4</sup>

Other corrections there are in the MS. But most of these were made to cleanse the work from angry words, carelessly inserted<sup>5</sup>—words which frequently indicate Burnet's regard for the Covenant. Thus it is not the 'cajolery' of Charles, but 'fair treatment,' that wins Montrose.<sup>6</sup> 'To have overawed the two Houses' replaces 'to have taught his British subjects their duty in a Kingly way.'<sup>7</sup> The 'violent and enraged Passion' of the Covenanters was once their 'wilful, desperate fury.'<sup>8</sup> 'The

<sup>1</sup> MS. 495-6.    <sup>2</sup> MS. 305.    <sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. [ix].    <sup>4</sup> O.T. i.-xxxii.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Memoirs*, p. [ix].    <sup>6</sup> MS. 219 ; cf. *Memoirs*, p. 148.

<sup>7</sup> MS. 316 ; cf. *Memoirs*, p. 193.    <sup>8</sup> MS. 494 ; cf. *Memoirs*, p. 311.

ministers [in 1640] were likewise very busy' is corrected from 'were also the Evangelists of blood.'<sup>1</sup> The direct references to Sanderson, and the bitter revilings throughout against such 'Scribbling Historians' and against the authors of the 'many scandalous Pamphlets,'<sup>2</sup> are also insertions in the original draft, where names were avoided, and dissent expressed in saner and gentler speech. But such changes are less important than the additions and subtractions already mentioned and referred to; and they are of interest only as indicating the spirit of prejudice which Burnet brought to his task. With such corrections, and with a wholly rewritten preface, the MS. was sent to press.—I shall now indicate the more important suppressions in the folio of 1677, to which end I shall use the original draft as far as it goes, supplementing from other sources.

Hamilton's first commission as royal agent in Scotland is dated 20th May, 1638,<sup>3</sup> by which time the troubles there were somewhat advanced. Burnet therefore gives 'a requisite Introduction' to the history of Hamilton's commissionership; this introduction, moreover, was not made out of the Hamilton papers.<sup>4</sup> But there are certain omissions, like the Resumption of the Tithes, the 1633 Parliament, and the Balmerino Trial,<sup>5</sup> though all these call for some consideration from the historian of the Scottish Troubles. Moreover, Hamilton was with Charles at his coronation in Scotland; and Balmerino's Trial has been laid to his displeasure.<sup>6</sup> Regarding the Tithes, Burnet pleads it was not among his papers, nor had 'any Relation to the Concerns of these two Brothers.'<sup>7</sup> This disregards his former statement as to sources; and it is not quite certain that the Hamiltons have no connection with this affair. The first two letters,<sup>8</sup> printed by Burnet, refer to some 'business' between the King and Hamilton, and we are not made clear as to what is the reference. The *History of my own Times* mentions, in this connection, the private purchase, by Charles, of Aberbroth abbey,

<sup>1</sup> MS. 243; cf. *Memoirs*, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> v. *Memoirs*, pp. [iv.] and [vii.].

<sup>3</sup> H.M.C. Rep. xi. App. 6, p. 47.

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 28.

<sup>5</sup> v. *Memoirs*, p. [vii.].

<sup>6</sup> S.P. Dom. Apr. 1640. Printed in App. to *Ham. Papers* (Cam. Soc.). For Burnet's knowledge of the Trial's importance, cf. O.T. i. 38.

<sup>7</sup> *Memoirs*, p. [vii.].

<sup>8</sup> From Charles to Hamilton, dated respectively '4 March, 1627,' and 'first day of the Year, 1628,' v. *Memoirs*, p. 3.

that Hamilton might seem to yield his church-lands to the crown, as an example to the nation.<sup>1</sup> The date of this transaction raises a suspicion that it might be the 'business' of the *Memoirs*; if so, Hamilton enters Scottish politics earlier than Burnet would have us believe. Suppressions is perhaps too strong a term for these omissions, but the whole trend of the book inclines one to think they are, at least, designed omissions.

It tends to confirm this attitude that Burnet lays the entire blame of the Scottish Troubles upon the bishops; the royal commands behind their tyranny are passed over. In an early interview between Hamilton and Charles on one side and Laud with the Scottish bishops on the other, Ross related 'that this three years the English service book was used in his cathedral. How that came and by what warrant, I understood not,' says Hamilton; 'but his Majesty acknowledge[d] it was done by his order.' This omission may seem slight; but it hides the early and personal interference of Charles himself.

At this same interview Charles announced Hamilton's appointment, adding that the latter accepted much against his will. The addition was made, says Hamilton, 'upon my representation of what was the report of the Court,'<sup>2</sup> referring probably to murmurs that he procured the employment from the King. Burnet omits the motive, for he has already declared the choice unanimously recognised as the fittest possible.<sup>3</sup> The unanimity is far from certain.

Hamilton reached Berwick on 3rd June, 1638, and advised Charles to prepare for war as rapidly as possible. On the 9th he entered Edinburgh, and began his game of negotiating to gain time. His first aim was 'to get some Lawyers to declare the Covenant to be against Law';<sup>4</sup> but this proved impossible; for Hope, the King's Advocate, was a Covenanter; Sir Thomas Nicolson began to find a conscience for his legal decisions; and Sir Lewis Stewart would offer none but secret assistance. Burnet's account of their opposition is from Hamilton's letter of November 2, 1638;<sup>5</sup> but his remarks are placed to suggest that Hamilton found them hostile on his arrival. To this end, perhaps, he omits an incident which, if fully known, might explain the opposition of these lawyers, and the fact that it

<sup>1</sup> *v.* O.T. i. 29.

<sup>2</sup> *Ham. Papers*, p. 2; cf. *Memoirs*, p. 43.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 38.

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 53.

<sup>5</sup> *Ham. Papers*, p. 51.

arose really some five months after Hamilton entered Scotland. Traquair, writing the *Marquis*, says he has sent the 'answers and resolutions [of Hope, Stewart, and Nicolson] to his Majesty's interrogatories.'<sup>1</sup> What were these 'interrogatories,' and what the 'answers' of which the *Memoirs* are so silent? Very probably they would reveal negotiations with Charles, which prompted some reasonable doubt of his sincerity. In the face of Burnet's suppressions elsewhere, I find it difficult in such a case to regard the omission as probably unimportant.

Hamilton made his third journey into Scotland, armed with the King's Covenant. On 21st September, 1638, as a foretaste, he told the Covenanters the royal answer stipulated 'that a free Assembly and Parliament should be immediately indicted';<sup>2</sup> but they seemed disappointed. The disappointment is explained by Charles' qualification—judiciously dropped by Burnet—'if they [the Covenanters] were not the hinderers of it.'<sup>3</sup> Such qualifications in the King's letters were no novelty in Scotland. The Covenanters knew that the phrase, omitted by Burnet, was in reality the negation of every grant depending on it. After a similar fashion Burnet misrepresents another interview of the following day.<sup>4</sup> And the unanimity, on one point, of the immediately succeeding Council is left to suggest its unanimity on all points under discussion, when, as a matter of fact, it was far from being as royalist as desired.<sup>5</sup> Suppression of such mere phrases may seem slight and tedious to complain of, but they involve a misrepresentation of the parties concerned; and by such means it is that Burnet so often contrives to colour his facts to his preconceptions, to write history within his prejudices.

Burnet's account of the first Bishops' War affords two important points for criticism. Hamilton, in the Forth, still exerted himself to gain time; and one of his conferences was witnessed by Sir Henry De Vic, whose account is printed by Burnet.<sup>6</sup> It shows that Hamilton cut the Covenanters short, and acted throughout on his uniform principle of giving answers which should not commit Charles to anything. Hamilton's own letters contain an even less favourable version. 'There is now,' he writes Charles, 'no more doubt to be made but that you will be so fast in your leaguer that it will not be in their power

<sup>1</sup> *Hard. State Papers*, ii. 103. <sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 79.

<sup>3</sup> *Ham. Papers*, p. 27. <sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 80; cf. *Ham. Papers*, p. 30.

<sup>5</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 81; cf. *Ham. Papers*, p. 30. <sup>6</sup> *Memoirs*, pp. 133-5.

to do the least affront to your army, so as [=that] my further treaty in these parts where I am is to no end, since that is effected which was laboured for, your Majesty being in security.<sup>1</sup> To omit these touches is to hide the real characters of the two men, whose insincerity all through had brought things to the present pass.

The second point concerns one of the King's letters. Burnet has confessed to the suppression of passages revealing weakness, craft, or anger in the King;<sup>2</sup> this letter is an excellent example of his method. It is defiant, acknowledging to Hamilton that the Scots at present have the advantage; but Charles doubts not 'to force them to obedience (in time)', by various courses; 'the which rather than not do,' he concludes, 'I shall first sell myself to my shirt.'<sup>3</sup> Burnet omits this unkingly phrase; he also omits the date, and places the letter in a chronological sequence almost a month too late.<sup>4</sup> The MS. not only inserts the omitted phrase; it places the letter earlier, and dates it correctly, 10th May, 1639,<sup>5</sup> by which it becomes clear that Charles, even more than Hamilton, was determined against peace. Comparison with the MS., in this instance, proves beyond doubt the dishonesty with which Burnet used his documents.

After the Pacification of Berwick, the commissionership devolved upon Traquair. Hamilton was reserved to discover the Covenanters' intentions from the lords invited to discuss an arrangement with Charles at Berwick. To this end, on 17th July, the King gave him a written warrant, should he ever be accused, 'to use what means he pleased, and speak to them what he thought fit.'<sup>6</sup> The MS. inserts the warrant at length; comparison shows that Burnet's subsequent summary tends to soften its tone. 'You will be necessitated to speak that language,' it reads, 'which, if you were called to an account for by us, you might suffer for it.'<sup>7</sup> The warrant is nothing short of a permit to play the traitor. Burnet indeed, till he discovered it, had difficulty in reconciling Hamilton's speeches at the time with strict loyalty;<sup>8</sup> but to enter his excuse in full would have revealed Charles in a most unfavourable light. A better

<sup>1</sup> *Ham. Papers*, p. 87.      <sup>2</sup> O.T. i. 531-2.

<sup>3</sup> MS. 176; cf. *H.M.C. Rep.* xi. App. 6, p. 103.

<sup>4</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 136; cf. *Ham. Papers*, p. 81.      <sup>5</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 148.

<sup>6</sup> MS. 219. The warrant is printed in *Hard. State Papers*, ii. 141-2.

<sup>7</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 148.

instance of that monarch's crafty methods would be far to seek.

In Scotland, meanwhile, Traquair proved a poor substitute for Hamilton; and on 30th August he exasperated Charles by signing the Covenant in Assembly. When Parliament met a month later he was forced to change front; he prorogued it till 14th November. The Scots recognised his right, but despatched a protest to London. Dunfermline and Loudon made a second journey before Charles would notice their mission—in a way, moreover, they could little relish. Traquair had obtained possession of a letter directed by the Scots to the French King; and, on the plea of being implicated in this correspondence, Loudon was promptly clapped in the Tower. Burnet's account of his imprisonment is vague and hesitant;<sup>1</sup> but tradition has preserved a completer version he related to some English peers when the *Memoirs* were published. Charles, it seems, in a fit of temper issued a warrant to behead Loudon next morning. Sir William Balfour of the Tower and Hamilton followed the King to his bedroom to advise against it; and only after Hamilton represented the probable effect in London did Charles destroy his warrant. Burnet, relating this incident, excused its omission as not fit to be told.<sup>2</sup> Tradition perhaps tells too much. Loudon, near his release, 'was very fearful'; and Hamilton advised using this fear to persuade him to the royalist side.<sup>3</sup> I am inclined to think the story slurred over by Burnet was concocted by Hamilton to this end.<sup>4</sup> Loudon was liberated on 27th June, 1640, after signing an agreement to serve Charles among the Covenanters.<sup>5</sup>

So far Hamilton had retained the royal favour without a break, and in spite of rumours and complaints. Whether or not he regretted the Berwick warrant, Charles' suspicions begin now to destroy their mutual understanding. The suppressions

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 161.

<sup>2</sup> v. Birch, *Enquiry concerning Charles I. and Glamorgan in 1644-5* (ed. 1747), App. pp. 14-6. Birch had the story from an MS. note by White Kennet (in his copy of the *Memoirs*), who had it from a Mr. Frazier present when Burnet told it. Frazier mentioned the affair to Hamilton, who lent the papers, and who remembered reading it there himself.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 170.

<sup>4</sup> The original papers are missing. But cf. Scot's *Staggering State* (ed. Rogers), p. 51. Also *D'Israeli on Charles I.* (ed. 1830), iv. 357-64.

<sup>5</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 171.

indicated are designed as much to screen the King as to cover Hamilton. Hereafter the purpose is rather to hide the fact that Hamilton, save at a pinch, was never again so fully trusted.

In August, 1641, Charles arrived in Scotland to preside over his next parliament. It was a promise in the Treaty of Ripon; but storms brewing in England were a help to the fulfilment. He came too late, for the Covenanters were now organised under Argyll; Incendiaries and Banders had been securely dealt with; the demands presented were greater than ever, and were extorted from Charles one by one. Meanwhile Hamilton's 'pains' with Argyll sent whispers of his disloyalty about Court. Burnet quotes an Act of Parliament pronouncing Ker's 'scandalous words' against the Marquis 'rash and groundless'; and exalts it for a proof that the Argyll intrigues were conducted with the royal consent. But the relevancy of this proof is not obvious; the Act apparently indicates older attacks. Burnet himself confesses that 'all this while the Marquis was insensibly losing ground with the King'; and when Lanark requested an explanation of the royal change of favour, he was answered that the King believed him personally an honest man, but that 'his Brother had been very active in his own Preservation.'<sup>1</sup> The fact is Hamilton, as he put it later, 'feared an absolute Compliance with the Parliament,'<sup>2</sup> in which case he might be asked to re-enact the part of Strafford, and both he and his brother were concerned to save themselves.

On the back of this coolness, in October, occurred the Incident. The exact significance of this plot must remain a mystery till it can be discovered who originated the reports. The MS., unlike the print, gives a long detailed account, which suggests that Burnet had materials before him for faithfully solving the problem. It is therefore regrettable that he purposely withholds just the information we want. 'I am far from asserting,' he says, 'there was any such treachery designed, and therefore I do not name the persons who were charged with it.'<sup>3</sup> Argyll's ambition, Hamilton's eagerness to be on the winning side, their known intrigues at the time, and the prominence of Hamilton's creature, William Murray of the Bedchamber, in the development of the plot, incline me to fill the blanks with agents of

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, pp. 185-6.

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 188.

<sup>3</sup> MS. 303. The Incident occupies MS. 290-303.

Argyll and Hamilton themselves. 'An absolute Compliance' meant defeat to Argyll, to Hamilton danger. Murray, after the lords had withdrawn, corresponded, advising when and how the King might be regained.<sup>1</sup> He also, apparently, first attributed suggestion of the plot to Montrose.<sup>2</sup> Was it because Hamilton's letter of 12th October 'was misrepresented, as if he had charged the King with the design'?<sup>3</sup> I doubt very much whether the three lords 'had ground to apprehend a hazard'.<sup>4</sup> The plot bitterly disappointed Charles of his hopes; and he was certainly indignant at everything that led up to it. 'The King declared publicly in Parliament,' says a pamphlet, 'that however now [Hamilton] seemed to comply with them, he was the only man that incensed him against that Kingdom';<sup>5</sup> and this report receives some colour from Lanark's own account of the fiasco.<sup>6</sup> But on his departure Charles received Hamilton again into favour, and permitted him to continue his dealings with Argyll. They might help his new policy, arising out of news of the Irish rebellion. This policy had barely succeeded when war broke out in England.

Already before the war agents of the Parliament had made capital in Scotland of the suspected insincerity of the late grants. Hamilton, having recovered from an illness, had therefore gone north 'without any positive Instructions,' merely with recommendations to the King's service in general.<sup>7</sup> He reached Edinburgh early in July, 1642. In December Lanark reinforced him, bearing renewed assurances from the King. Both failed to create a royalist party of any influence; and on September 25, 1643, the rebels joined issue in the Solemn League and Covenant. Hamilton's aim now was to delay the sending of help; but he warned the King that even this would be impossible after that winter. A plot was designed to muster under pretence of solemnizing Lady Roxburgh's funeral. Hamilton attended with 200 horse, but the whole muster was no more than 1000, and mutual jealousies were against success had there been more.

<sup>1</sup> MS. 296-7.

<sup>2</sup> *H.M.C. Rep.* iv. pp. 163-70.

<sup>3</sup> MS. 292, where also the letter is given.

<sup>4</sup> MS. 303.

<sup>5</sup> *Manifold Practices*, p. 17.

<sup>6</sup> *Hard. State Papers*, ii. 302. 'His Majesty let fall some expressions to my disadvantage.' MS. 302 reads 'advantage,' in accordance with preceding narrative (MS. 293). But the context is against Burnet.

<sup>7</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 194.

Severe measures were enacted against the King's friends. The Hamiltons were particularly threatened; and in the end of November both withdrew to Court.<sup>1</sup>

Charles' confidence in Hamilton was unshaken, apparently as late as 28th September.<sup>2</sup> But when he reached Oxford the Duke was made close prisoner and Lanark confined to the town. There is reason to believe their enemies had some hand in this change of favour,<sup>3</sup> for Charles evidently proceeded on the belief of the Court. But that belief was not groundless. Hamilton apparently opposed the Roxburgh plot at first,<sup>4</sup> and misrepresented the attitude of the Scottish nobility to procure permission to attend parliament.<sup>5</sup> His inaction, and Lanark's applying the King's signet to the proclamation which mustered Leslie's army,<sup>6</sup> though unmentioned in the *Memoirs*, may explain the later confession that they fell in heartily with the Scots, to win them to Charles, once their army was in England.<sup>7</sup> Hamilton's conduct, if only for its weakness, deserved imprisonment; and Lanark did well to escape with all speed to Scotland, where he straightway signed the Covenant,<sup>8</sup> and became the 'prime person of power' against Montrose.

Hamilton was imprisoned in Pendennis, and later in the Mount; he was liberated when the latter surrendered to Parliament in April, 1646, and rode post to London.<sup>9</sup> In July he was at Newcastle, where, 'when he first kissed the King's Hand, His Majesty and he blushed at once.'<sup>10</sup> He urged Charles to yield to the Propositions; and in August crossed into Scotland to attempt again the formation of a royalist party. Lanark also returned, and soon regained the royal favour.

This mutual forgiving and forgetting was more superficial than Burnet paints it. On May 4, 1645, Charles wrote his Queen: 'Of late I have been much pressed to make Southampton Master

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, pp. 247 and 250. <sup>2</sup> v. Charles' letter, *Memoirs*, p. 247.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 250; cf. also Baillie, *Letters and Journals*, ii. 1245, and Clarendon (ed. Macray), iii. 286, 317 *et seq.*

<sup>4</sup> Clarendon, iii. 285.

<sup>5</sup> Clarendon, iii. 286, 284.

<sup>6</sup> Clarendon, iii. 285. Lanark pleaded he had no other course, if he was to retain his freedom to help the King (286).

<sup>7</sup> O.T. i. 60.

<sup>8</sup> MS. 425; cf. also Guthry's *Memoirs* (ed. 1747), p. 151.

<sup>9</sup> Clarendon, iii. 286, and iv. 142-51, which also gives some incidents of the imprisonment.

<sup>10</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 279.

of my Horse not more for good will to him as out of fear that Hamilton might return into a capacity of recosening me.' Burnet tries to explain away the harshness of 'recosening'; but a sense of failure, perhaps, prompted him to omit the letter.<sup>1</sup> Similar passages occur in the royal correspondence throughout 1646. The opposition, Charles complains on 14th September, threatens him in the negotiations; 'albeit, duke Hamilton brags that he hath hindered much, and particularly that their boastings were not made authentic by writing; but for this (nor the truth of any of his actions) I will not answer, nor any that I can speak with, but those who are absolutely his creatures.'<sup>2</sup> Sir Robert Murray, whose letters were the main source for this year, was less in the royal confidence than Burnet imagined.<sup>3</sup> But he mentions that Hamilton noted Charles' 'unhandsome reservedness';<sup>4</sup> and the correspondence relates how the Duke pressed the King hard to sign the Covenant, which fact alone would generate ill-feeling and distrust.<sup>5</sup> Nor was Charles' suspicion unjustified. In London, after his liberation, Hamilton followed his brother's example, and signed the Covenant himself; he signed it again in Scotland, after leaving the King at Newcastle.<sup>6</sup> Ruining fortunes never inspired Hamilton's loyalty. Whatever reception Charles extended the brothers, he retained his suspicions; and the Covenanters, at least, had good reasons for regarding neither as an enemy.

After the 'sale' of the King, in which Burnet 'spared the Memories and Families of the unhappy Actors,'<sup>7</sup> there remains only Carisbrooke Treaty and the Engagement Campaign. The Treaty is dismissed shortly,<sup>8</sup> though Burnet professes 'a just and full Representation of His Majesties Imprisonment.'<sup>9</sup> Whether we have a précis here, as with the Incident, must remain doubtful; for the MS. is preserved incomplete.<sup>10</sup> Lauder-

<sup>1</sup> MS. 426. <sup>2</sup> *Charles in 1646* (Cam. Soc.), p. 65.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 277; cf. *Charles in 1646*, p. 72, and *Ham. Papers*, p. 112.

<sup>4</sup> *Ham. Papers*, p. 109.

<sup>5</sup> 'This damn'd covenant is the child of rebellion, and breathes nothing but treason, so that if Episcopacy were to be introduced by the Covenant, I would not do it' (Chas. to Hen.).—*Charles in 1646*, p. 86.

<sup>6</sup> *Gen. Ass. Com. Records* (pub. Sc. Hist. Soc.), pp. 23-4. Hamilton signed in Scotland Aug. 12-3. Burnet mentions neither instance, but it may have been from want of evidence.

<sup>7</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 312.

<sup>8</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 334.

<sup>9</sup> *Memoirs*, p. 335.

<sup>10</sup> The last words are, 'coming to Richmond for' (*Memoirs*, p. 318).

dale, one of the three signatories, played a part not very creditable;<sup>1</sup> and his revision of Burnet may have removed details, if he is not the prime cause of the curtailment of the MS. The Engagement Campaign is a favourable specimen of Burnet's employment of hearsay. Turner apparently contributed what he afterwards embodied in his *Memoirs*; but Lieutenant-General Drummond and Dachmont supplied details, which were accepted as corrections of Turner.<sup>2</sup> Much of this personal information may be quite correct; but the most important pieces were contributed by Lauderdale; a few, only less important, by Charles II. Both had a main finger in encouraging Burnet's abuse of actual documents; when they volunteer to supplement those documents or to explain away difficulties, their information cannot be accepted unconfirmed.

But suppression was unavoidable with Burnet's object in view. To eulogise Charles, and to couple Hamilton as far as possible in the same eulogy—these aims controlled the composition of these *Memoirs*.<sup>3</sup> The picture of Charles here painted should be compared with the estimate in the *History of my own Times*.<sup>4</sup> Neither Charles nor Hamilton is a fit subject for eulogy. Burnet, in the MS. preface, has deleted the following confession: 'Neither shall I tell how soon it [the *Memoirs*] was finished, nor with what caution it was considered, what things concerning those times were fit to be published, or what were to be suppressed.'<sup>5</sup> It cannot have been because he altered the texture of his book, the chief value of which must always lie in the documents there printed. Otherwhere it is a one-sided and frequently distorted source for the events it describes.

ROBERT DEWAR.

<sup>1</sup> He agreed to cede the Northern Counties to Scotland, *v. O.T.* i. 59.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Turner's *Memoirs*, and Burnet's letters (18th and 22nd Aug. 1673), App. ii. 249 and 251.

<sup>3</sup> *Memoirs*, pp. 379, and [iv].

<sup>4</sup> *O.T.* i. 532.

<sup>5</sup> MS. 9.

## The Scottish College in Paris

TO the lover of old Paris and its history there is not a more interesting quarter than that of the Panthéon, with its numerous churches and colleges. If after passing Saint Etienne du Mont we descend the rue Clovis, we shall find ourselves in the rue du Cardinal Lemoine, and facing a large four-storied building bearing the inscription 'Institution Chevallier,' with a small tablet over the doorway on which is engraved 'Collège des Ecossois.'

It was in 1313 that David, bishop of Murray, first conceived the project of sending four poor scholars from his diocese to study at the Paris universities in order to prepare them for missionary work at home. It must have needed much courage to face the dangers and perils of a long journey by land and sea. For in those days the voyage from Scotland to France was a lengthy and expensive one.

On 28th February, 1325, David bought, with funds from his privy purse, a farm or manor called 'La Fermette' or Fermeté, together with divers portions of arable land situated in the village of Grisy, near Brie-Comte-Robert, then in the province of Brie, and now forming part of the department of Seine-et-Marne. The revenues derived from this farm were to be devoted to the support and education of four scholars of Scottish nationality at the University of Paris. The college of Cardinal Lemoine not only consented to lodge these scholars, but also contributed largely towards the purchase of the 'Fermette.' In August, 1326, the acquisition was amortized by letters patent bearing the seal of Charles-le-Bel.

For several years the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine continued to shelter the four scholars, one of whom was student of divinity and the three others students of arts. In order to compensate the directors for the expenses thereby incurred, the domaine of Grisy was ceded to the College. This arrangement, however, was not to be of long duration.

In 1333 David's successor, John, bishop of Murray, declared that the treasurer, in relinquishing all rights to the domaine of Grisy, had acted unwisely and without the sanction of his superiors. The directors of the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine, justly indignant at such ingratitude, retorted that the revenue from the farm was utterly inadequate to support four scholars, the said revenue only amounting to fifty livres per annum.

On 8th July, 1333, the college agreed to restore the farm to the treasurer, and dismissed the scholars, who now found themselves without a roof-tree.

John, bishop of Murray, having reimbursed the college for the sums lent to his predecessor, the farm of La Fermeté became the property of Scotland.

Until the latter half of the sixteenth century, the bishops of Murray, in their position as administrators of the fund, had the right to elect the bursars; but in 1573, at the death of Patrick Hepburn, last incumbent of the bishopric in Scotland, the bishops of Paris assumed this right, and henceforth elected the scholars.

For nearly three centuries the bursars, now deprived of the kindly shelter afforded to them by the Collège du Cardinal Lemoine, lodged hither and thither as best suited their modest means. In vain the 'boursiers de Grisy,' as they termed themselves, petitioned the authorities at home to grant them some fixed official residence in the French capital. But the Catholic Church in Scotland, already entering on a period of trouble and disaster, was in no state to attend to their humble plaints.

In 1566 the principal, Thomas Winterhop, wrote to Queen Marie Stuart begging her to augment their allowance, that more scholars might, profiting by a sojourn in Paris, benefit the Catholic faith at home. The Queen promised to do all that lay in her power to help the neglected bursars, and faithfully did she keep her promise. Throughout her own bitter trials and unjustifiable imprisonment she did not forget the poor scholars in her beloved France. Not only did she pension annually a certain number of youths, but in her will she left of her humble fortune what she could for their benefit.

Another enthusiastic advocate for the Scottish students was James Beatoun, or Bethune, archbishop of Glasgow and ambassador at the court of France. In 1569, together with Thomas Winterhop, he founded a college for Scottish students in Paris, and bequeathed in his will various monies, and a

house situated in the rue des Amandiers, close to the Collège des Grassins.

‘Collapsam hanc fundationem longa successionis serie, distractis plerisque redditibus, Thomas Wynterhop, presbyter, postea collegii primarius et totius Universitatis procurator, auctoritate felicis memoriae Mariae Galliarum tunc et Scotiæ reginæ, obtentis litteris patentibus Francisci II. Galliarum etiam et Scotiæ regis anno Domini M.D.LIX, in integrum restituendum curavit.

‘Soli episcopi moravienses pro tempore erant hujus fundationis provisores nati. Verum defuncto anno Domini M.D.LXXIII, Patricio Hepburn, postremo catholicae communionis episcopo moraviensi, tota alumnorum hujus fundationis aliorumque Scotorum Parisiis studentium cura devota est in reverendissimum Jacobum de Bethune, archiepiscopum Glasguensem in Scotia, tunc Parisiis legatum beatæ memoriæ Mariæ, reginæ Scotiæ, quæ dum ab Elisabetha angla in captivitate detinebatur, zelo catholicæ fidei et hortatu ejusdem archiepiscopi legati sui mota, auctum alumnorum numerum, quamdiu superfuit, pensione annua donavit.’<sup>1</sup>

Thanks to the liberality of this worthy archbishop the number of scholars was much increased, and the college, once more established, seems to have entered an era of prosperity. James Bethune, realizing the difficulties which beset the young aspirants to priesthood in Scotland, obtained from Pope Gregory III. a brief, dated September 26, 1580, whereby the bishops of Paris and Meaux were entitled to confer priesthood on any of the Scotch scholars in Paris. So great was the modesty of the good archbishop that he would not allow his name to appear in the deed of purchase of the house in the rue des Amandiers.

By a deed dated March 6th, 1602, the sieur Loret declared that this contract ‘was for, and in the names of, poor scholars born in the country and kingdom of Scotland, that they might study at the Université de Paris, and likewise that he personally renounced all rights to the aforesaid house, the price of the same having been paid into his hands by a pious individual, who had prayed him to lend his own name for the purchase of the above-mentioned house.’<sup>2</sup>

In a codicil dated April 24th, 1603, one day before his death, James Bethune bequeathed ‘to the poor scholars of Scottish

<sup>1</sup> Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 3322, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Archives Nationales, M. 250.

nationality, studying at the University of Paris, all his estate not already disposed of by his previous will, and principally a house situated in the rue des Amandiers, Paris, adjudged to the sieur Loret, procurator . . . and purchased by him with the monies of the said gentleman, who is designated in the deed of purchase as a "pious individual." The day after signing this codicil, the excellent archbishop died, and was buried in the Lady Chapel of the church of Saint Jean de Latran, Paris, where a handsome monument was erected to his memory.

The house in the rue des Amandiers belonged to the Scottish College until 1846, when it was sold.

James Bethune desired that the new college should be under the supervision of the Carthusian monks of Vauvert, Paris; they had full powers to nominate the superiors and bursars, and they managed all the money transactions. Though the Murray and Bethune scholars lived under the same roof, the two funds for their maintenance were kept quite distinct until 1639, when they were united by the order of Jean de Gondi, archbishop of Paris, which order was confirmed by Louis XIII. in the following December, and verified in Parliament, September 1st, 1640.<sup>1</sup>

For some time complaints had been made that the bishop of Paris was in the habit of giving sums from the bishop of Murray's fund to priests who had long left the college; the prior demanded that the fund, as originally intended, should be devoted to the scholars, and to them alone. In 1662 the principal, Robert Barclay, finding the building somewhat small for present requirements, decided to buy some plots of land situated on one side by the establishment of the Pères de la Doctrine Chrétienne, and on the other by the English Nuns' Convent. Building operations were at once commenced.

Three years later the present Collège des Ecossais was practically completed, although the north wing,<sup>2</sup> together with the chapel dedicated to Saint Andrew, was not built until 1672, probably for want of funds. An old plan drawn by Bernard Jaillot dating from the end of the eighteenth century shows us a

<sup>1</sup> Archives Nationales, X<sup>th</sup> 8654. Folio 139.

<sup>2</sup> M. Lefèvre in his work, *Les Anciennes Maisons de Paris*, declares that the building is much anterior to this date, and that it was formerly the hôtel de Verberie; and to prove this assertion he cites the splendid old oak balustrade, still existent, which adorns the staircase up to the top storey.

large quadrangular, four-storied building, in the middle of which was an inner court with flower-beds and a poultry-yard. From the windows at the back of the building there must have been a pleasant view of distant trees.

One entered the college through an arched portico leading to a fine staircase; on the first floor, to the left, was the chapel, which was vaulted, rectangular in shape, and occupied the whole front of the north wing; it had four bays, three in the nave and one in the chancel. A little room behind the chancel served as sacristy. A passage to the right led to two class-rooms, close to which were the library and the refectory. The second floor was inhabited by the principal, the prior, and the other college officials. The scholars lodged on the third floor. In the basement was the kitchen, with the usual offices. Another plan, made by M. Hochereau in the beginning of the last century, gives us an excellent idea of the building in its present condition.

In order to gain admittance, the scholars had to prove that they were of Scottish nationality, Catholics, born of Scottish parents legitimately united in marriage, under the age of sixteen years, and sufficiently educated to take their places in the third or fourth classes. Only aspirants to holy orders were admitted. The number of scholars was limited, according to the state of the funds. The future priests were chosen by a delegate specially sent from Paris to Scotland for this purpose, and on his approval the scholar addressed to the prior a request for admittance. The expense of the voyage to France was sometimes paid by the college; the return journey was always so. The scholars, once safely housed in the college, led a very austere life; they never left its shelter except to attend the different classes at the Collège de Navarre, or to go to mass at the neighbouring abbey of Sainte Geneviève. After the completion of the chapel, even this diversion was forbidden.

The scholars studied and took their meals together, but each was allowed a little room to himself. Theology and belles-lettres were the only studies countenanced. The college lodged, fed, and supported the scholars free of charge. At the age of eighteen, if they had finished their studies in a satisfactory manner, they had to declare their intention of taking holy orders. In case of refusal, they were instantly despatched back to Scotland. Even if ordained deacon, the scholar was liable to be sent home if he shewed no special vocation. On occasion a very promising pupil would be allowed an extra year's study.

When James II. came to France he interested himself in the college, and persuaded Louis XIV., in 1688, to grant a new patent. The French monarch, ever desirous of supporting the Catholic faith, did so, and expressed a wish that the college might be under the guidance of the Carthusian monks, that the scholars might enjoy all the privileges accorded to the other scholars at the University of Paris, and that the prior, principals, and their successors might be natives of Scotland, and subjects of the king.

This patent was registered by the Parliament, July 12th, 1688; it completely freed the college of all its debts, and gave it the official position which it had hitherto lacked.

In this same year the college authorities purchased another house with its adjoining land that they might sub-let it, and thus increase their funds.

On this piece of land two houses (formerly Nos. 58 and 60 of the rue du Cardinal Lemoine) were built; these, by sub-letting, considerably added to the college funds. Mention may here be made of the rue d'Ecosse, still existing, which derived its name from the Scottish scholars, who found it convenient to lodge there owing to its close proximity to their college.

In 1701 James II. died, and his faithful friend and servitor, James, Duke of Perth, erected a monument to his memory in the chapel; of this monument we shall speak later. The unfortunate king, a frequent visitor to the college, bequeathed his memoirs to its keeping; unfortunately, they disappeared during the French Revolution.

It is in 1700 that we first notice the name of Innes, which, during the eighteenth century, was to play so prominent a part in the history of the college. Three members of this family held the post of rector: Lewis Innes, confessor to James II. (died 1738), his brother Thomas (died 1744), and Alexander Innes, who fought so nobly for the interests of the college during the troubrous time of the Revolution.

On several occasions the college was gratified by favours received from the head of the Catholic Church; we have already mentioned how Gregory III. had entitled the Bishops of Paris and Meaux to confer priesthood on the scholars. A century later, Urban VIII. likewise authorised the college to present candidates for ordination without dimissorials. The period from 1688 to 1718 seems to have been the most successful in the history of the Scottish college.

In 1707 a new statute was made by Dom Charles François Maurin, prior of the Chartreux monks of Paris, and Lewis Innes, principal of the college ; it confirmed the Carthusian priors as the perpetual superiors of the college. It was they who superintended the scholars and the entire establishment. They nominated the principals and priors, the inspectors of the studies and the bursars. Once a year they had to furnish an account of the state of the college funds. The principal had to be of Scottish nationality, a former pupil of the college, and to possess the diplôme du maître ès arts.

The principal's powers were practically unlimited ; he superintended the scholars' studies, and, month by month, verified the treasurer's accounts. Though possessed of so much authority, he was nevertheless obliged to devote all his time to the pupils' interests, and could not absent himself for more than three months at a time without special permission. If this absence was prolonged beyond six months, he was deprived of his salary and post. The purveyor was nominated for three years, at the end of which time he could be re-elected ; it was he who managed all the monetary affairs, superintended the purchase of provisions, clothing, and furniture, managed the servants, and attended to the letting of the houses belonging to the college. He could not spend more than 200 livres at a time without special permission, and was on no account allowed to sign any papers or conclude any business without first obtaining the prior and treasurer's approval. The two offices of treasurer and purveyor were kept entirely distinct ; however, in the absence of the treasurer, the purveyor might on occasion take his place.

The principal, purveyor, and inspector of studies lodged in the college itself. As will be seen, their salaries were modest : the principal receiving 250 livres per annum, the purveyor 200 livres, with 50 livres for petty expenses, and the inspector of studies 200 livres. Of the different scholars the 'étudiants-clercs' received 8 livres yearly, and the 'étudiants-prêtres' 12 livres ; a subsidy of 200 livres was granted to any student who left the college to become a missionary.

The inspector of studies was appointed to keep order among the scholars ; he superintended their studies, and shared the post of librarian with the principal.

It is much to be regretted that so little is known about the library. The first mention we find of it is in a document

preserved at the Archives Nationales, dated 1660, when it appears to have possessed 30 printed volumes and about 225 manuscripts, among which were the documents concerning the foundation of the college, the *Heures d'Anne de Bretagne* (a very rare work), and the cartulary of the church of Glasgow.

The Bibliothèque Mazarine possesses a manuscript in folio,<sup>1</sup> entitled 'Statuta collegii Scotorum Parisiensis,' which contains the rules of the library. M. Alfred Franklin, in his excellent work, *Les Anciennes Bibliothèques de Paris*, declares that he has never met with a more complete or better chosen set of rules. The inspector of studies had to see that all the volumes were properly arranged and inscribed in two catalogues, one of which was in his keeping and the other in the principal's keeping. The librarian was responsible for any damage done to the books. Every year, as well as at the expiration of his term of office, he was obliged to produce all the volumes inscribed in the catalogue.

We here reproduce chapter ix. of the said rules :

*De Bibliotheca Collegii.*

I. *Præfector studiorum pro tempore ordinarius erit bibliotheca custos.*

II. *Omnis libri in bibliotheca collegij nomine inscribantur, et in quibus deest, suppleatur; et, quam meliori fieri potest ordine, loculis conserventur.*

III. *Inventarii librorum duo serventur exemplaria, unum penes primarium, alterum penes custodem, cui, quando claves traduntur, significatur ipsum, in annua lustratione et cum officio decedet, juxta illud inventarium singulorum librorum rationem redditurum.*

IV. *Nullus liber a quocunque e bibliotheca extrahatur vel commodetur, nisi post descriptum in regesto (quod in eum usum in bibliotheca servabitur) manu mutuantis vel custodis, libri titulum, et nomen ipsius cui mutuo datur, cum nota diei et mensis, et ordinali bibliothecæ numero.*

V. *Cavebit diligenter custos ne libri extraneis aut omnino foras extra collegium commodentur. Majori adhuc cautela aget, si de libris rarioribus, majoris pretii, aut qui pluribus constant voluminibus, primario aut propriario visum fuerit aliquos commodare alicui de cuius fide constat.*

<sup>1</sup> Bibliothèque Mazarine, Manuscrits, 2413.

VI. Inventarium sive catalogus librorum, et regestum librorum mutuo datorum, diligenter a primario in lustrationibus inspiciuntur, ne quid desit, et libros de novo datos vel emptos inventario curabit ascribendos, cum nomine donatorum, si qui sint.

VII. Libri hæretici et prohibiti in hac diœcesi seorsim in tabulario sub clave conserventur.

VIII. Unicuique socio collegii, in sacris duntaxat ordinibus constituto, aditus et clavis bibliothecæ conceditur, post emissum infra scriptum promissum de observandis his statutis. Non tamen ei licebit quemvis librum, etiam in proprios usus, e bibliotheca extrahere, nisi de licentia custodis, et descripto prius in regesto mutuatorum libri titulo; alteri autem cuicunque libros e bibliotheca mutuo dare penitus ei licebit.

IX. Præfectus etiam bibliothecæ cum admittitur, hanc infra scriptam promissionem, perfectis his statutis, coram primario et procuratore faciet; eademque exigetur ab unoquoque cui aliquæ bibliothecæ clavis concreditur.

‘Ego infrascriptus, spondeo et promitto quod, omni qua potero cura et diligentia, cavebo ne libri bibliothecæ hujus quovis modo abstrahantur, deperdantur, permutentur, deformentur, sive per me vel per alios; et quod, si quid horum acciderit mea vel aliena culpa, superioribus fideliter indicabo; quodque omnia et singula suprascripta statuta circa bibliothecæ custodiam exacte observabo, et ab aliis, in quantum potero, observari curabo. In cuius rei fidem præsentibus manu propria subscrispi in dicto collegio, die . . . mensis . . . anni . . . N. N.’

X. Servetur etiam a præfecto index librorum omnium classorum; habeatque libellum in quo quoscunque eorum in alumnorum usum dederit describet.

It is strange to think that, with all these precautions for the preservation of their books, the college authorities never stamped or marked them in any way.

A little more than a century later, during the French Revolution, Messieurs Dupasquier and Naigeon, in an official report made to the Comité d'Instruction Publique, said: ‘In the ci-devant Collège des Ecossais we found a quantity of books piled one on the top of the other, and about thirty engravings in the sacristy behind the choir.’

Up to the second quarter of the eighteenth century the college formed many worthy missionaries; but we learn from

a report made by Monseigneur Lercari to the Prefect of the Propaganda, that religious dissensions, caused by the success of Jansenism among the students, induced many to abandon the priestly calling and to enter the army. Indeed, from 1737 to 1764 no priests were ordained from the college.

A decree having been made, September 7th, 1762, by which all the smaller university colleges were united into one large one, that of Louis-le-Grand, the Scottish scholars loudly protested, declaring that they, as foreigners and bursars, not ordinary scholars, could not be touched by such a decree. So well did they plead their cause that they succeeded in keeping their independence.

In the beginning of the French Revolution it seemed for a while as if the college would escape molestation. A law passed by the Assemblée Nationale, November 7th, 1790, ordained that all religious institutions and educational establishments founded in France by foreigners should continue to enjoy all former rights and liberties. The following year Dr. Geddes, vicar apostolic, came to Paris to look after the college interests. He found it, indeed, in a pitiable condition, one student, one priest, and the principal, the abbé Gordon, being the sole inhabitants of what was once a flourishing institution. Dr. Walsh, of the Lombard College, received Dr. Geddes, and together they endeavoured to put new life into the old college. But the decree of August 18th, 1792, and the law of August 30th, ordering the closing of all secular establishments and the sale and sequestration of all property owned in France by foreign communities, completely destroyed all hopes of success.

The College Committee did not allow their college to be confiscated without protesting, affirming that their establishment was only the foreign branch of a home community. The Convention recognized their rights, and decreed, February 14th, 1793, that the law of August 30th, 1792, did not touch their college, and that they might continue to occupy it until further notice.

The decree of March 8th ordering the sale of all property belonging to the French colleges and religious institutions, excepted those establishments still provisionally governed by their former administrators abroad. Two months later a decree was passed, May 9th and 11th, 1793, followed by the laws of the 19th Vendémiaire and 13th Pluviôse, second year of the Republic (October 10th, 1793, and July 1st, 1794),

ordering the confiscation of all property owned in France by subjects whose rulers were at war with the Republic. These measures, of course, meant annihilation to the Scottish College. During some months (1793-94) the college had been used as a prison, and Saint-Just, on the 9th Thermidor, was imprisoned here for several hours until his friends came to liberate him.

On the 15th Nivôse, an II. de la République (January 4th, 1794), the Commune ordered the confiscation of all the valuables owned by the Scottish College; on the 18th of this same month the commissioners of the Section of the Sans-Culottes executed this order and affixed their seals to all the doors of the building. Soon after the college archives and library were removed to the Bureau du Domaine National. Again the committee protested, and the Commune, by the law of the 14th Nivôse, an III. (3rd January, 1795), ordered the college to be reinstated.

The Bureau du Domaine National du Département de la Seine also decided, on the 13th Brumaire, an IV. (November 4th, 1795), to restore the college, with all its property, to its rightful owners.

The prime factor in this restoration was Alexander Innes, nominated purveyor, August 17th, 1794, by the prior of the Chartreux. On the 5th Vendémiaire, an V. (September 26th, 1796) he saw his untiring efforts crowned with success, and received back from the Bureau du Domaine National all the deeds and titles, which once more reinstated the college.

During the next eighteen months the college enjoyed a peaceful existence. The Directoire, however, on the 6th Prairial, an VI. (May 25th, 1798), wishing to enforce the law made 13th Pluviôse, an II., ordered the sale as national property of all establishments belonging to foreigners living in France. A law having been made the previous year (July 13th, 1797) whereby the Collège des Ecossais had been, as a charitable institution, exempt from confiscation, the Directoire formed another law, 13th Messidor, an VI. (July 11th, 1798), deciding that all scholarships were to be united together at the Prytanée Nationale. The Consuls on May 24th, 1800 (4th Prairial, an VIII.), confirmed this decision, and ordered that a certain number of places should be reserved in the Prytanée for the Scottish scholars. This aroused new protestations, and the Directoire on the 19th Fructidor, an IX. (September 6th, 1801),

annulled this decree, and decided that the colleges were to be allowed to enjoy their former rights, their funds to be managed gratuitously by a Bureau according to the rules made by their benefactors, no monies to be paid without the approval of the Secretary of State. The 24th Vendémiaire, an ix. (October 16th, 1802), the Irish and Scottish colleges situated in other towns in France were united to those in Paris. The scholars, meanwhile, were boarded at the *Prytanée Nationale*. The funds of the English college were likewise joined to those of the Irish and Scottish colleges, to be managed by the above-mentioned Bureau. The 24th Floréal, an xiii. (May 14th, 1805), with the consent of Dr. Cameron, the scholars of the Scottish college went to dwell in the *Collège des Irlandais*, rue des Irlandais.

On November 15th, 1808, it was decided (with Napoleon's approval) that the management of the college funds was to be given over to the principal and committee of the *Université Impériale*. On September 23rd, 1813, it was decreed that the funds of the three colleges were to be managed separately, as complaints had been made and none of the parties were satisfied.<sup>1</sup> In 1814 Dr. Walsh, the administrator, was able to publish a satisfactory report of the college affairs. He says: 'I took charge of the Scottish section in a state of ruin, with a proven debt of 23,349 francs, and I left it with an income of 11,000 francs and its buildings repaired.'

Dr. M'Pherson, who came to Paris about the year 1815, found the funds in a very prosperous condition, thanks to Dr. Walsh's able management. The college buildings, being no longer inhabited by the Scottish scholars, were sub-let to the committee of another educational establishment. In 1816, with the approval of Louis XVIII., Dr. Farquharson was appointed superior of the Scottish section; this Dr. Farquharson had formerly been superior of the Scottish College founded at Douai in 1559 by Mary Queen of Scots. Dr. Farquharson died in 1817, and was succeeded by the abbé Desjardins, a French priest. December 27th, 1818, saw once more the funds of the three colleges reunited; a paid trustee, as well as a treasurer and secretary, were engaged, and their salaries paid out of the common fund. In 1818, although the college's revenue had increased to the sum of 14,000 francs, the Scottish committee

<sup>1</sup>The abbé Gordon, notwithstanding his great age (being at that time 75), begged to be allowed to resume his duties as rector.

again protested, alleging that their portion of the funds was too small to permit of any salaries being paid. Their cause, eloquently pleaded by Dr. Paterson, received a favourable hearing, and on March 3rd, 1824, their funds were separated from those of the English and Irish Colleges, on condition that the said funds should be administered by a Catholic priest of Scottish nationality appointed by the Secretary of State; the Scottish administrator might also delegate his authority to a French priest appointed by the same Secretary of State. The aspirants to holy orders, whose nomination was to be subject to the Secretary's approval, were to complete their studies at different French seminaries.

The Collège des Ecossais was sold in 1846 to M. Chevallier, who turned it into a private school. M. Régis Grousset is now the director, and under his management the 'Institution Chevallier,' as it is still called, has become a very prosperous establishment, frequented chiefly by candidates for the baccalauréat ès lettres.

In 1874 the abbé Jouannin, prior of the Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, Paris, was appointed to manage the funds of the Scottish College, now only extant in name. The pupils were placed, according to age, either at the seminary of Issy (near Versailles), or at the seminary of Saint-Sulpice. It is interesting to note that the old farm, 'La Fermette,' at Grisy, still belongs to the Scottish College fund, and that owing to the rise of value in land, its revenue has considerably increased.

In 1906 the law 'des Congrégations' came into force, by which all religious institutions were bound to furnish information concerning the source of their revenues, and to submit to an annual visit from the municipal authorities. The Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice, having refused (with numerous other religious establishments) to submit to this law, its scholars were dispersed; and the Scottish students, to the number of 16, went to study at the theological schools of Issy and the newly-established institution at No. 19 rue Notre Dame des Champs, Paris.

The old building of the 'Collège des Ecossais' has not altered much since the middle of the eighteenth century. Over the entrance is affixed a small black marble tablet forming the crown of the archivolt, and bearing in gilt letters the inscription: 'College des Ecossais.' The arched doorway, decorated with a wood carving representing Saint-Andrew's Cross and initials, leads one into the hall, upon entering which one is struck by

the magnificent black oak staircase reaching to the top storey. Some of the glass doors are decorated with Saint-Andrew's Cross, and the handsome bronze door-handles, also bearing the cross and initials, are well worth attention. By the courtesy of the director of the institution, strangers are permitted to visit the chapel, which, though much altered, must always be interesting to lovers of Scottish history. Nearly one half of the chapel has been partitioned off to serve as a museum of physics and entomology, leaving but one bay and the choir to serve as chapel. Over the altar is a large picture representing the martyrdom of Saint-Andrew.

A full-length portrait of James III. is to be seen in the principal's study ; it represents the Pretender in armour.

In the museum the fine oak furniture carved with thistles and the cross and initials of Saint Andrew should be examined.

On one of the northern pillars in the chapel is a black marble slab, arched at the top, surmounted by the armorial bearings<sup>1</sup> of David and Bethune, with the following inscription :

D. O. M. Anno Dom. mcccxxv. Regnante in Gallia Carolo Pulchro et Roberto de Bruce Regnante in Scotia, antiquo fædere conjunctis David de Moravia, Episcopus Moraviensis in Scotia hoc Collegium fundavit : Aº Dni MDCIII. Iacobus de Bethun Archiepiscopus Glasguensis in Scotia, novam Fundationem instituit, Præposito in perpetuum administrationi Ven. P. Domno Priore-Cartusia Parisiensis, Aº Dni MDCXXXIX., conjunctio utriusque Fundationis in unum et idem Collegium ab Archiepiscopo Parisiensi facta, auctoritate Regis et Supremi Senatus Parisiensis sancta est. Vtriusque fundatoris Memoriae Primarius, Procurator et Alumni Hujus Collegij P. P. Requiescant in pace.

This tablet measures  $3\frac{1}{2}$  inches by  $17\frac{1}{2}$ .

Unfortunately, many of the tablets and tombs have disappeared ; however, the *Collectanea topographica et genealogica* (volume vii. page 34) gives a plan representing the different positions occupied by the monumental tablets, and with the help of this plan it is easy to imagine the chapel as it was in its original state.

One of the college statutes contained a clause that a yearly mass was to be said for the repose of the souls of David, bishop of Murray, and James Bethune : ' Singulis annis, omnes magistri

<sup>1</sup> The archbishop of Glasgow's escutcheon, with the motto : ' Ferendum vincas,' bears a chevron with three estoiles : James Bethune's shield is quartered argent with fesse gules, together with three muscles argent, and chevron or sable, with an otter's head argent ; beneath the shield is a dolphin bearing a round fruit in its mouth. The escutcheons are further ornamented with the archbishop's hat, mitre, cross, and crosier.

et alumni hujus collegii interesse tenentur togati sacro celebrando die nono januarii in capella collegii pro primo fundatore, Davide de Moravia, episcopo moraviensi, et apud Sanctum Joannem Lateranensem, die vigesima quarta aprilis, sacro celebrando collegii expensis pro secundo fundatore Jacobo de Bethun, archiepiscopo Glasguensi, et utroque die lautius prandium eis conceditur.<sup>1</sup>

In the centre of the second bay of the nave was a flat stone tomb, bearing the following epitaph engraved on a large oval slab, the top ornamented with palms encircling the initials R.B., and supported by a cenotaph decorated with mouldings, under which was a winged skull crowned with laurel leaves placed between two flaming urns :

Hic jacet fælicis memoriae sacerdos, Robertus Barclaius, ex nobili familia apud Scotos, hujus quondam collegii gymnasiarcha dignissimus et de patria sua optime meritus. Illi ingenium perspicax, judicium accuratum, mores casti, fides eo ferventior quo rorior inter suos, totaque vita ad amissim Evangelii castigatissima. Collegium olim prope Grassinaum situm huc, in locum magis commodum transulit, domunque et ædem sacram extreundas curavit, disciplinam pene collapsam restituit, tandemque, collegio hærede instituto, obiit vii idus februarii, anno Domini M.D.CLXXXII, ætatis suæ circiter LXX, regiminis xxx. Requiescat in pace.

To the right of this tomb was buried the heart of Lewis Innes, under a rectangular slab of white marble, which bore the following inscription in a heart-shaped frame ornamented with a skull crowned with laurel and cross-bones :

Hic situm est cor domini Ludovici Innese, presbyteri, Reginæ matri Magnæ Britanniae, dein Jacobo III. Regi eleemosynarii, hujus collegii primarii et beneficioris insignis Obiit die II februarii Anno Domini M.D.CXXXVIII. Ætatis LXXXVII. Requiescat in pace.

In the part of the chapel now used as a museum we find all that still remains of the monument erected to the memory of James II. by his faithful and devoted servitor, James Drummond, Duke of Perth. A print of this monument, as designed by Louis Garnier, exists in the Collection Clairambault. Before the re-arrangement of the chapel, it was on the right hand side of the nave in the third bay, exactly facing the chapel door. This monument, even now by far the most important in the building, was composed of a large grey marble pedestal, supporting a black marble sarcophagus, on the top of which was a small obelisk standing on another pedestal on which was a little vase ;

<sup>1</sup> Bibliothèque Mazarine, Ms. 3322, p. 14.

this pedestal was half hidden by fringed and tasselled curtains, all in white marble. In the centre of the pedestal supporting the obelisk was an urn in gilt bronze, decorated with a royal crown; in this urn James II.'s brain, according to his desire, was enclosed after his death in 1701; cupids were seated on either side of the pedestal. To the top of the obelisk was fixed a medallion, surrounded by palms, bearing the king's portrait under another royal crown. A sword and sceptre were placed between two bronze lions' heads above the sarcophagus. Two large armorial cartouches were affixed, one in the centre of the sarcophagus and the other on the basement of the mausoleum. Unfortunately, all these ornaments (which were in gilt bronze), together with the urn containing the brain of James II., disappeared during the French Revolution.

Some few years ago, M. Grousset, while making some excavations previous to opening a passage between two of the college buildings, found the leaden casket which had once contained the prince's brain. Though filled with cement and painted to imitate the marble, the holes left by the nails where the ornaments were torn off the stone are distinctly visible.

All that remains of the once handsome mausoleum is the white marble obelisk and the long black marble tablet, on which the following inscription is still legible :

D. O. M. Memoriae augustissimi principio Jacobi II<sup>di</sup>, Magnæ Britanniæ etc. Regis. Ille partis terra ac mari triumphis clarus, sed constanti in Deum fide clarius, huic regna, opes et omnia vitæ florentis commoda postposuit. Per summum scelus a sua sede pulsus, absalonis impietatem, Achitophelis perfidiam et acerba Semei convitia invicta lenitatem et patientia, ipsis etiam inimicis amicus, superavit. Rebus humanis major, adversis superior et cœlestis gloriae studio inflammatus, quod regno caruerit sibi visus beatior, miseram hanc vitam felici, regnum terrestre cœlesti commutavit. Haec domus quam prius principes labantem sustinuit et patrie fovit, cui etiam ingenii sui monumenta, omnia scilicet sua manuscripta custodienda commisit, eam corporis ipsius partem qua maxime animus viget, religiose servandam suscepit. Vixit annis LXVIII, regnavit XVI, obiit XVII kalendas octobris, anno salutis humanæ M.D.CC.I. Jacobus dux de Perth, praefectus institutioni Jacobi III, Magnæ Britanniæ etc. Regis, hujus domus benefactor, mœrens posuit. F. P. L. Garnier, 1703.

The entrails of Marie-Beatrix d'Este, second wife of James II., were buried beneath a rectangular slab of white marble at the foot of her husband's monument. The inscription ran :

D. O. M. Sub hoc marmore condita sunt viscera Mariæ Beaticis Reginæ Magnæ Britanniæ, uxoris Jacobi II, matris Jacobi III, Regis. Rarissimi exempli princeps fuit, fide et pietate in Deum, in conjugem, liberos eximia, caritate in

suos, liberalitate in pauperes, singulari. In supremo regni fastigio christianam humilitatem, regno pulsa dignitatem majestatemque retinuit; in utraque fortuna semper eadem, nec aulae deliciis emollita nec triginta annorum exilio, calamitatibus, omnium prope carorum amissione fracta quievit in Domino vii maii, anno M.D.CCXVIII Ætatis anno LX°.

Under a lozenge-shaped white marble slab, close to the above, were placed the entrails of Louise-Marie Stuart, second daughter of James II. and Marie-Beatrix d'Este. It bore the following inscription :

D. O. M. Hic sita sunt viscera pueræ regie, Ludovicæ Mariæ, quæ Jacobo II, Majoris Britannia Regi, et Mariæ Reginæ divinitus data fuerat, ut et parentibus optimis perpetui exilii molestiam levaret et fratri dignissimo regii sanguinis decus, quod calumniantium improbitate detrahebatur adsereret. Omnibus naturæ et gratiæ donis cumulata, morum suavitatem probata terris, sanctitate matura celo, raptæ est ne malitia mutaret intellectum ejus, eo maxime tempore quo spe fortunæ melioris oblata, gravius salutis æternæ discrimen videbatur aditura xiv kalendas maii MDCCXII, ætatis anno xix.

The heart of Mary Gordon, duchess of Perth, was interred at the foot of James II.'s monument under a rectangular tablet of white marble bearing the following inscription surrounded by a heart-shaped frame :

Hic situm est cor Mariæ de Gordon de Huntly, ducissæ de Perth primariæ apud Reginam Magnæ Britanniæ matronæ. obiit xiii martii, anno Domini M.DCCXXVI.

At the end of the nave, to the right, a large slab of white marble bordered with black, was sunk into the pavement; this slab was curved at the top and bore the Drummond arms (shield or, with three fesses gules) and an inscription commemorating James, Duke of Perth, died 1716.

To the left of the above tomb was another exactly similar, to the memory of James, Duke of Perth, died 1720.

Facing the inscription to James Bethune and David, bishop of Murray, and fixed to the other pillar, was an epitaph engraved in gilt letters on a black marble tablet curved at the top.

At the end of the nave, in the centre of the aisle, was a lozenge-shaped slab bearing a cross and the following epitaph :

¶ Hic jacet dominus Andreas Hay ex nobili apud Scotos familia, vir probitate et pietate insignis, ob fidem in Deum et erga principem exul, plenus dierum et bonorum operum, de hac domo bene meritus, obiit die xxiii novembris, anno Domini MDCCII. Requiescat in pace. Amen.

In the centre of the wall at the end of the chapel was fixed

a small rectangular black marble tablet in a frame of Languedoc marble adorned with volutes and mouldings, and supporting an arched fronton between two urns painted to imitate bronze; this tablet was erected to the memory of the famous beauty, Frances Jennings, duchess of Tyrconnell.

D. O. M. *Æternæ memoriae illustrissimæ et nobilissimæ dominae Franciscæ Jennings ducissæ de Tyrconnell, Reginæ Magnæ Britanniæ matronæ honorariae hujus collegii benefactricis quæ missam quotidianam in hoc sacrario fundavit perpetuo celebrandam pro anima sua et animabus domini Georgii Hamilton de Abercorn, equitis aurati, conjugis sui primi, et domini Richardi Talbot, ducis de Tyrconnell, proregis Hyberniæ, secundi sui conjugis. Obiit die xvii martii, anno Domini M.D.CXXXI. Requiescat in pace.*

Close to the former monument, slightly to the right hand side, was a small black marble slab bearing a cross at the top and at the bottom a laurel-crowned skull lying on flaming torches and cross-bones, commemorating 1675.

We close the list with one which, though it does not directly concern the Scottish College, still bears on its role of honour a name often mentioned in the earlier part of our article. The tablet, erected to the memory of eight brave ex-scholars of the Institution Chevallier who fell in the Franco-German war, begins with the name :

Ed: Paul de Bethune, Fernand Bourgeois, Marie-Aimé Delargilliére, Marie-Emile Courcier, Paul Desmolins, Leon Gugenheim, Paul Lebœuf, Charles Rouillard. "Quos neque lugeri neque plangi fas est admiratione potius et similitudine decoremus." 1871.

VIOLETTE M. MONTAGU.

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray

*The Reign of Edward III., as recorded in 1356 by Sir Thomas Gray in the 'Scalacronica,' and now translated by the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart., continued.*

The second troop of the French charged the English on horseback. Many of the English who were overthrown rose up and rallied on foot, having killed many of the Frenchmen's horses as they passed; and these Frenchmen, thrown from their horses, ran with the others, their comrades of the advanced guard who had been thrown already, to the Englishmen's horses, nearly all of which they took and mounted. The English posted themselves on their knees behind a low wall of Antain. The rearguard of the French halted in front of them and remained there all day on horseback, and <sup>MS.</sup> <sub>fo. 227<sup>b</sup></sub> moved off at night. The English, having nothing more to do, marched afoot, lance in hand, four leagues through the country to an English fortress.

Outside this castle of Lusignan many a pretty feat of arms had happened to the Lord of Montferrand while he was captain thereof after it had been taken by assault by the English,<sup>1</sup> which castle was afterwards betrayed out of their hands by a castellan.

And then there were other times, as in the expedition on St. George's day for the relief of Saint-Jean-d'Angeli, where John de Cheverstoun, an English knight and seneschal of Gascony, with the barons of the country and nine hundred men-at-arms, fought with the French, who, being twelve hundred men-at-arms, left the siege to come against them. They dismounted and engaged hotly, the mellay lasting a considerable time. The French were defeated with great loss,

<sup>1</sup> It was taken by the Duke of Lancaster in 1346.

the Maréchals de Niel and de Oudenham, French commanders, were taken there, and many others slain and taken. This Maréchal de Niel was soon afterwards killed in battle by the English in the war of Brittany, at Moron, near the wood of Onglis, where several barons of Brittany were slain, one of the most wonderful affairs that happened in the war of Brittany, always excepting the affair of Lankaderet, where Thomas de Dagworth, an English knight, admirably defeated the barons of Brittany. Many affairs took place in that war, whereof all cannot be recorded.

But after truce had been concluded in Gascony by the Prince of Wales, son of the said King of England, the aforesaid English of the commonalty continued the war, as has been partly described above, in many parts of the realm of France.

Now as all the events are not recorded in order as they occurred, there remain to be mentioned the people who had gathered into companies in consequence of this truce, doing so in the quarrel of the King of Navarre, who was already delivered from prison in the castle of Crêvecoeur, and for the reason above mentioned was at war with the French. This king, as is mentioned more fully above, laid waste several districts in France, chiefly by means of the said English, whereby the said English recovered many fortresses in many parts of France, levying ransom on the country by parishes and having many a combat, with loss at one time and with gain at another. Near Nevers, the Englishman John Waldbouf having his half-hundred of English men-at-arms, fought from the castle of Corvol-Orgeilleuse with the Arch-priest<sup>1</sup> who was captain of the district of Nevers and had two hundred men-at-arms, and defeated them, taking prisoner the said Arch-priest and many others.

This Arch-priest was allowed to go free on parole, as true prisoner to Waldbouf; but never after would he come in endeavouring to make quite another agreement with the said Waldbouf, offering to enlist under the English king and hand over to the said Waldbouf a fine fortress which he had. But he [the Arch-priest] would never afterwards meet him [Waldbouf] without hostages during these negotiations.

The said Waldeboef rode after other enemies, and fought a duel with a Frenchman from the castle of Nôtre-Dame-de-

<sup>1</sup> See page 267, *supra*.

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray 419

Coucy on the challenge of the French. They engaged with sword and dagger, and the said Waldbouf beat the Frenchman and took him prisoner. Waldbouf had such assurance in the deceitful parole of the said Arch-priest that he trusted himself to his good faith, and accepted his humble invitation to dine with him in a castle of his,<sup>1</sup> which castle he was held bound to surrender under the conditions agreed on. Waldbouf was betrayed and kept prisoner there for some time and then was murdered in prison, on the pretext that he had meant to seize the said castle by concert with the other English prisoners, [namely,] the hostages who had been given for the said Arch-priest and who were kept prisoners in the same manner.

In the same season the English before Troyes were defeated through their own bad management by Count Wadmound, who sallied from the city before which the English were in ambush, having sent their scouts to the barriers of the said city, placing them unskilfully, so that the enemy, unperceived by them, sent some light horse into the middle of the ambush, which was in a village, where they [the English] were dispersed in the houses, so that they could not rally, but it was each one for himself. Some were taken; [but] the knight John de Dalton and others withdrew in good order; most of which English, with other garrisons, gathered together out of Brittany and Normandy and the other fortresses which they had through the country, and took by night the city of Auxerre, where they found very good booty, and remained there a considerable time. The citizens, with the consent of the lords of the country, made terms with them [under which] they [the citizens] were to pay them a large sum of money to evacuate the said city without setting it on fire; to which they [the English] having agreed, threw to the ground a great deal of the city wall, and went off to their fortresses in the neighbourhood, which seemed more convenient to them than the city, because they could not well live together, as each one claimed to be master. Wherefore they took assurance for the money.

And so soon as they had departed in this manner, the country people and townsfolk hired German soldiers and foreigners for the same money as they had caused to be collected and levied from the commonalty for the use of the

<sup>1</sup> *A prendre ou à la soupe*—misrendered *souper* in *Maitland Club edition*.

MS.  
fo. 228<sup>b</sup>

English under the said agreement. Thus very soon they brought in a great force of soldiers and caused the said city to be fortified anew more strongly than before, [all] with the same money, without paying anything to the English.

Another time, a hundred English lances [marching] to the relief of the castle of Brienne, which was in English hands, defeated in Burgundy a great force of soldiers of the country—five hundred men-at-arms—attacking them on foot several times in a heavy field of corn, the French being mounted.

John de Fotheringhay, with other English captains, [coming] out of the town of Creil, attacked a fortress and an abbey which the French had fortified between the said Creil and Compiegne, carried the palisade and the fosses with the base court, [when] those within treated for their lives with those without. The captain of the garrison came out and surrendered to the pennon of one of the English commanders, whereat one and another of the English took offence, wrangling for a share in his ransom, so that in the strife he was murdered among them. He to whom he [the captain] had surrendered went off straightway in a rage, telling them that it served them right.<sup>1</sup> Those within the fortress, seeing that they were bound to die, with one consent descended a vaulted stair with such din, shouting and clattering of shields and staves, with other noises, yelling the different war-cries of the chief men of the country, that the English who had remained fell into such a sudden panic, believing that they had been betrayed, partly because of the departure of the said captain who had gone off in a rage in the manner [described], partly by the bold front and spirit of the enemy, that they fell back in disorder, each man falling over the others in the deep water of the ditches, where five or six English knights and several others were drowned. Others who could get on horseback fled, and thus the people of the fortress were saved, being for the most part, only brigands<sup>2</sup> and common folk of the band of Jacques Bonhomme.

<sup>1</sup> *Le bien leur encouenait.*

<sup>2</sup> *Brigauntz*—literally, a soldier armed with a light cuirass, but the term received a secondary signification during this rising. ‘Originairement on nommoit brigands les soldats qui portoient cette armure ; et comme ceux que la ville de Paris soudoya en 1356, pendant la captivité du roi Jean, commirent une infinité de vols, on désigna ainsi depuis les voleurs et coquins. C'est ainsi qu'en latin *latro*, qui signifioit soldat, désigna par la suite un voleur, parce que les soldats en faisoient le métier.’—[Roquenfort, *sub voce* ‘brigandine.’]

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray 421

From Epernay, the fortress which the Englishman James de Pipe had won, English knights and esquires, under command <sup>MS.</sup> fo. 229 of John Griffith, made a raid near Cher,<sup>1</sup> where Bek of the French serfs<sup>2</sup> advanced with eighty men-at-arms and forty archers to attack seven men-at-arms and twelve archers of the English, who were separated from their column. The said English defeated the said French, and captured Bek and twenty French knights and esquires by the aid of some of their comrades who had been separated from them and who came up at the moment when the enemy was defeated. The said Bek was captured several times during this war.

In the same season of the year of grace 1359 the English had stormed and won the town of Saint-Valery, and lost it when besieged by the Comte de Saint-Pol, by the Lord of Fiennes, who was Constable of France at that time, and by the lords of that district.<sup>3</sup> Monseigneur Philip de Navarre, brother of the said King of Navarre, and a liegeman of the King of England, came from Normandy and other parts with six hundred English lances [drawn] from the English garrisons to relieve the said Saint-Valery, but found it had fallen.<sup>4</sup> They rode into the district of Vermand, where, near Saint-Quentin, the Comte de Saint-Pol with those of the lords [who had been] at the said siege and were not yet dispersed, and with fifteen hundred lances and three thousand armed commons, came near before the said English—scarcely further off than the range of an arblast—and lay before them all day without fighting. In the evening the said English billeted themselves in a village near at hand, and marched off towards noon<sup>5</sup> on the next day, in the direction of Soissons, burning the country without any interference from the said French.

In the same season a company of English stormed the town of Vailly in the vale of Soissons, whence they took the town of Pontarchy. Riding from this place to relieve the castle of Sissonne, where their German comrades were beleaguered, they encountered of a sudden a hundred Breton men-at-arms, and

<sup>1</sup> *Pres de Cherres*, perhaps Chercy near Sens.

<sup>2</sup> *Vileins*.

<sup>3</sup> The sense of this passage is destroyed in the *Maitland Club Ed.* by a comma here instead of a full stop.

<sup>4</sup> See Froissart, Book i. cap. xciv. for a fuller account. Froissart says the siege lasted from August till the following Lent.

<sup>5</sup> *A haut hour*.

both sides dismounted. The Bretons were defeated, many of the English were wounded, some of which English remained on horseback without doing anything to support their comrades until the affair had been settled.

The said English abandoned their intention of relieving [Sissonne], wherefore the place was surrendered.

MS.  
fo. 229<sup>b</sup> There were many occasions during this war when the French came in presence of the English and the two parties separated without fighting. On one occasion in Auvergne, near Nôtre-Dame-de-Puy, the French were 20,000 fighting men, of whom 4000 were knights and esquires, Thomas de la Marche being their commander. They came before 900 English lances under Hugh de Calverley, [but] they separated without fighting.<sup>1</sup> Next day they followed them and again approached so near that they threw stones [at each other]; [but] once more they moved off without any engagement except a skirmish.

Soon after this, because the councils of the said Kings of England and Navarre could not come to an agreement, the said King of Navarre made peace with the Duke of Normandy (who was called Dauphin of Vienne, son of King John of France, and in the absence of his father was called Regent of the country), and chiefly for the deliverance of Queen Blanche, sister of the said King of Navarre, who was beleaguered in Melun. She had been wife of King Philip of France, his uncle. Also in order to recover his fortresses which were kept from him and to obtain greater ease as a change. All this had been accorded to him in treaty on a former occasion before Paris, sworn to on God's body and broken by the said Regent, as the said King [of Navarre] declared. In accordance with which agreement, Poissy-sur-Seine, which had been captured<sup>2</sup> and was held by the English, and many other fortresses in several parts of the realm of France were evacuated and given up by the English. Nevertheless the said King of Navarre had hardly done any injury to the English throughout the following season.

On account of the same convention, the knight Thomas

<sup>1</sup> The punctuation of the *Maitland Club Ed.* greatly confuses the sense of this passage.

<sup>2</sup> *Qenforce estoit.* The verb *enforce* carried two technical meanings in warfare, 'to capture by force' and 'to fortify.' It is not always easy to distinguish in which sense it is used. In the following paragraph it is applied to the church of Barfleur, and seems to mean 'to fortify.'

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray 423

de Holland, who was in Normandy for the King of England, caused a fine fortress at the church of Barfleur to be strengthened, and remained therein to control Cotentin. This Thomas afterwards died in the country, the King's Lieutenant in the conquered districts, being Earl of Kent through inheritance by his wife.

This King of Navarre a short time before had helped to put down a great rising and conspiracy of the base commons, who had risen under Jacques Bonhomme whom they had made their leader to fight the gentry, which they did, as has before been more fully described.

In the same season Rainald de Gulioun, a French knight and Governor of Paris, was defeated and captured near Estampes by the English under Gilbert de Rodom, who was killed in that affair. The English were not more than fifty-three lances and eighty archers; the French were 700 men-at-arms and 400 brigands and armoured archers. This Rainald de Gulioun, before he had paid his full ransom, declared that he was discharged, so that his keeper, a false Englishman, went off with him; wherefore the said Rainald was challenged to a duel. This same Rainald had been taken prisoner formerly near Poitiers, where he was commander at the time, by a Gascon soldier, who, with thirty comrades defeated 200 French men-at-arms at the taking of the said Richard. [This happened] in the season a little before the battle at the said place. MS.  
fo. 230

In the same year after the Incarnation, 1359, the aforesaid King Edward of England, the third after the Conquest, led an expedition out of England with all the great men of his realm, his envoys having returned from the Pope, and arrived at Sandwich on his way to the war in France on the [feast of] the Nativity of our Lady. He was grievously delayed for want of ships, wherefore he could neither land [his forces] all at once nor at the place he intended. So he divided the crossing, sending the Duke of Lancaster with his retinue to Calais, to bring out of that town the Marquis de Metz with all his Germans who had gone there to support the said King [Edward]. This he did, and took the field with them, riding beyond the river Somme and attacking the town of Bray-sur-Somme,<sup>1</sup> where they crossed the ditches, shoulder deep in the water, to the foot of the walls.<sup>2</sup> Having suffered severely [in the attempt], they failed to take the said town,

<sup>1</sup> Miswritten Dray in original.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Froissart, Book i. cap. ccv.

losing some of their knights in the assault, and returned towards Calais to get intelligence of the coming of the said king.

The Earl of March,<sup>1</sup> who had crossed the sea six days before the said king, made a raid beyond Boulogne, burnt Étaples, and so returned.

The King arrived at Calais on Monday next, before All Saints, where he remained eight days. He divided his army into three [columns]; one he kept with himself, another column he gave to his eldest son the Prince of Wales; the third column he intended for the Duke of Lancaster. He marched from Calais on the Monday before Martinmas, when the said Duke of Lancaster met him on the Sunday, having spent five weeks afield in much want of bread and wine.<sup>2</sup>

The three columns marched by different routes. The said king kept the way by Saint Omer, near Arras, past Sambrai, through *Terrages*, *Loignes* and *Champagne*, to before Reims. The Prince, son of the said King, held the route by Montreuil, from *Hedyn* through *Pontives* and *Picardy*, across the river *Somme*, by *Neuil* and *Haan* into *Vermandois*, near which a knight, Baldwin Dawkin, master of the arblasters of France, was captured at that time, with other French knights of the Prince's,<sup>3</sup> attempting a night attack on the quarters of the Earl of Stafford, who defended himself gallantly.

About this time the Anglo-Gascon Vicomte de Benoge, who was entitled Captain of Busche,<sup>4</sup> came out of his district [passing] from one English garrison to another, crossed the river Seine under safe-conduct from the King of Navarre, and came to Creil which was then held by the English, from which town he took the Castle of Clermont in Beauvaisis. An English knight, John de Fotheringay, held this town of Creil in keeping for the King of Navarre, on sworn condition to deliver it on notice from the said king. He often<sup>5</sup> received summons [to deliver it], but refused to do so failing a large

<sup>1</sup> The English Roger Mortimer, not the Scottish Dunbar.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Froissart, Book i. caps. ccv. and ccvii.

<sup>3</sup> I.e. the Dauphin's.

<sup>4</sup> *Qui dit estoit capitain de Busche*, but the famous Sir Jehan de Grailli, fifth knight of the Garter, was commonly known as Capital de Buch, from the Latin *capitalis*. This Capital was so loyal to his English sovereign that he chose to die a prisoner in Paris in 1397, rather than win his freedom by deserting his allegiance.

<sup>5</sup> *Souent*, printed *souen* in *Maitland Club Ed*

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray 425

sum of money which he declared that the said king owed him, which money he received from the French in discharge of the said debt and handed over the said town to them.

The said John de Fotheringay strengthened at this time another fine fortress at Pont-Saint-Maxence, on the river Oise, where he remained.

The Prince [of Wales] held his aforesaid way by Saint-Quentin and by *Retieris*,<sup>1</sup> where the enemy himself fired the town to obstruct his crossing. [But] the prince's people forced a passage at Château-Porcien, whence he marched through Champagne to join his father's column before Reims.

The Duke of Lancaster followed a route between the king and his son, and the three columns formed a junction before Reims, lying all around the city in hamlets for a month at Christmastide.<sup>2</sup> From the column of the said prince the town of Cormicy was taken by escalade and the castle won, the keep being mined and thrown down by the people of the said prince.<sup>3</sup> On the challenge of the French in Reims, Bartholomew de Burghersh, an officer of the Duke of Lancaster's army, fought there à outrance by formal arrangement, where one Frenchman was killed and two others wounded by lance-point.

From the king's column, the Duke of Lancaster and the Earls of Richmond and March captured two fortified market towns, *Ostreys*<sup>4</sup> and *Semay*,<sup>5</sup> on the river Aisne and the border of Lorraine.

Lords and knights of the king's column made a raid from Reims nearly to Paris. They ambushed themselves and sent their scouts up to the gates of the city. They made such an uproar in the suburbs that those within the city had not the courage to come forth.

The bands of English were scattered in sundry places, those who had remained on their own account before the coming of the king being in different bands. One band was called the Great Company, which had remained in the field throughout the year in Burgundy, in Brie, in Champagne and in *Dairres*,

<sup>1</sup> ? Martiers.

<sup>2</sup> The omission of a full stop here in *Maitland Club Ed.* makes this passage unintelligible.

<sup>3</sup> See an interesting account of this in Froissart, l. i. c. ccix.

<sup>4</sup> ? Attigny.

<sup>5</sup> ? Signy-l'Abbaye.

and wherever they could best find provender. This Great Company had taken the city of Chalons in Champagne by night escalade; but the people of the said city rallied in the middle of their town on the bridge of the river Marne, which runs through the city, and kept them by force out of the best quarter of the city; wherefore they [the Great Company], finding it impossible to remain, were compelled to evacuate [the place]. This company disbanded soon after the coming of the king, and sought refuge for themselves.

There were other bands of English, one of which took by escalade the town of Attigny in Champagne at the time the said king came before Reims.

The said King of England afterwards broke up from before Reims, and marched towards Chalons, where he made a treaty with the people of Bar-sur-Aube, but they broke it, so he dispossessed them of their lands.<sup>1</sup>

An English knight, James de Audeley, took the fortress of *Chancu* in the vale of Saksoun from the Bretons under Hugh Trebidige. The said James came from his castle of *Ferte* in *Brie* to the army of the said prince near Chalons in company with Capital de Buch, who came from Clermont.

The said king having caused the bridge over the river Marne to be repaired, and over other very great rivers also, marched to the neighbourhood of Troyes, whence the Marquis de Metz and the Count of *Nidow*, and other German lords who had come with the king, went off to their own country partly because of scarcity of victual and [partly] from respect for the approach of Lent. Due allowance was made to them for their expenses.

The king crossed the river Seine near Méry-sur-Seine, and held his way by Sens and Pontigny into Burgundy. His son the prince followed him, and the Duke of Lancaster also; but for want of forage for the horses his said son left the route of his father, and quartered himself at Ligny-le-Châtel, near Auxerre, where the said prince's army suffered more from the enemy than in any other part of this expedition hitherto. Several of his knights and esquires were killed at night in their quarters, and his foraging parties taken in the fields, although the country was more deserted before them than in all the other districts,<sup>2</sup> so that they scarcely saw a soldier outside the fortresses.

<sup>1</sup> *Allaigna leur paix*, i.e. eloigna.

<sup>2</sup> *Toutez autres parties*: autres omitted in *Maitland Club Ed.*

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray 427

Five English esquires belonging to the army of the said prince, without [defensive] armour except their basnets and shields, having only one coat of mail and three archers, were in a corn mill near *Regentz*, a fortress held by the English not far from Auxerre. Fifty men-at-arms, the troop and pennon of the Lord of *Hanget*, came to attack them; but the five defeated the fifty, taking eleven prisoners; wherefore even the French of the other garrisons called this in mockery the exploit of fifty against five.

The said king remained at *Golion*<sup>1</sup> near *Montreal* in Burgundy, to negociate a treaty with the duchy of Burgundy; and here Roger de Mortimer, Earl of March and marshal of the army and most in the confidence of the king, died<sup>2</sup> on the 24th day of February.<sup>3</sup>

Three years' truce was taken with Burgundy, on payment to the said King of England at three terms [the sum of] <sup>MS.</sup> 200,000 florins *moutons*, the florin [being reckoned] at 4s. fo. 23<sup>1</sup><sup>b</sup> sterling.

The town of *Flavigny* in Burgundy, strong and well-fortified, which had been taken by the Englishman *Arlestoun*, was retaken from the hands of *Nichol de Dagworth*, being surprised at the time the negociations for a truce had just begun.

Near this town of *Flavigny*, the said *Dagworth* in the previous season had an affair with his thirteen English against sixty-six French lances. The English had occupied a narrow street at the end of a village, having drawn carts across the road before and behind them. They sallied from their shelter at their pleasure, wounding, killing and capturing some of the French. *Norman Leslie*, who had come from Scotland to help the French, was taken; the others were put to flight.

At the same time *William de Aldborough*, captain of *Honfleur* in Normandy, was taken by the French in a sortie, and his people were defeated. An English knight, *Thomas Fog*, who was in a fortress of his in the neighbourhood, hearing of this affair, threw himself into the said *Honfleur*, found it displenished of provender, and rode forth with other English garrisons in the neighbourhood, foraging in the country for supplies to the said town. They came suddenly upon 250 French men-at-arms and 200 archers

<sup>1</sup>? *Beaulieu*.

<sup>2</sup> *Se lessa morir.*

<sup>3</sup> A.D. 1360.

and arblasters, who were ambushed on the English line of march, Monsire Louis d'Harcourt and Baudric de la Huse being in command of the French. The English, numbering forty men-at-arms and one hundred archers, had the protection of a hedge. Both sides dismounted and engaged smartly. The French were defeated, their two leaders being captured, and with them several knights and esquires, and several were killed in the melliay. Louis d'Harcourt soon afterwards was released by the same English who took him, and they became Frenchmen with him.

At *Fregeuil*, an English fortress on the march of Beauce, a French knight who bore the name of the Chevalier Blaunce, challenged the constable of the said place to a personal encounter of two Englishmen against two Frenchmen. The encounter was arranged at a place agreed on. The Chevalier and his esquire were defeated by the two English, who were arrayed in scarlet, and were taken prisoners into the aforesaid English fortress.

About this time the English knight John de Nevill, with thirteen lances, defeated near *Estampes* fifty French men-at-arms, of whom several were taken prisoners. Beyond the *Cher*, in *Berry*, the Gascons and English of the garrison of *Aubigny* met with a defeat, several of them remaining prisoners of the French.

At this time French, Norman and Picardese knights, with others of the commonalty, 3000 fighting men, made an expedition into England at the expense of the great towns of France, with a show of remaining there so as to cause the said King of England to withdraw from France, in order to relieve his own country. These Frenchmen arrived <sup>MS.</sup> fo. 232 at *Winchelsea* on Sunday in mid Lent of the aforesaid year, remained in the said town a day and a night, set fire to it on leaving, and, in going off in their ships, they lost two ships which had taken the ground, and about 300 men [killed] by the commonalty who attacked them.

Near Paris Robert Le Scot, a knight on the English side, was taken and his people were defeated by the French, and his strengths were taken just when he had fortified them.

As the Prince of Wales, son of the said King of England, was marching through *Gastinois*,<sup>1</sup> five knights of the country

<sup>1</sup> In Anjou.

## The 'Scalacronica' of Sir Thomas Gray 429

with 60 men-at-arms and one hundred others, people of the commonalty, had fortified anew a country house in front of *Journelis*,<sup>1</sup> a fortress which the English held. The said prince suddenly surrounded these knights, bivouacking in the woods, and directed siege engines and assaults; wherefore the said knights, Monsire Jaques de Greville and Hagenay de Bouille, with the others, surrendered unconditionally to the said prince.

The said King of England, coming from Burgundy, lost two or three German knights from his army. They were killed in their quarters at night by Ivo de Vipont, a French knight, and his company.

And as the said king was marching through Beauce, near *Terry*, that castle chanced to be set accidentally on fire by those within it; wherefore most of them rushed out and threw themselves on the mercy of the said king. The castellan held the keep for two days and then surrendered to the said king, who caused the walls of the said castle to be razed.

In the same season thirty lances of the English garrison of Nogent-en-Brie defeated on the river Marne one hundred men-at-arms of the French garrison of *Terry*, and captured sixty of them.

<sup>1</sup> Printed, Fournelis in *Maitland Club Ed.*

[The conclusion of this translation of 'Scalacronica' will appear in the October number of the 'Scottish Historical Review.']

ED. S.H.R.

## Some Early Scottish Book-bindings and Collectors

THE earlier history of book-binding in Scotland is at present very obscure. The materials are not plentiful, and such as do exist have never been adequately examined. In a nation so given over to feud and warfare, internal and external, private libraries must have been uncommon, and the only old libraries that now remain are almost all connected with the Church or the Universities.

The libraries at Aberdeen and St. Andrews contain, as I know from experience, numbers of old bindings, for these two foundations were, fortunately for our purpose, not well enough endowed to indulge in a taste for rebinding, and a systematic search through their shelves would probably be fruitful in results. At Edinburgh the hand of the restorer is very much in evidence and a glance at the Drummond collection in the University Library with its rows upon rows of monstrous modern calf, makes one sigh to think of what may have been, but is now lost for ever. But there is no doubt that scattered over Scotland a very large number of books in their original bindings must remain, quite sufficient to afford material for a comprehensive survey of the subject, but its very fringe has hardly yet been touched. Books on book-binding ignore Scotland, and most Scottish bibliographers have ignored book-binding. But its importance is beginning to be recognised, and two papers on two early specimens, shortly to be referred to, have appeared lately in the *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society*, fortunately with fac-similes.

What the Scottish bindings up to about the middle of the fifteenth century were like we have at present few means of knowing, they were probably either extremely highly ornamental and valuable if the book was treated as a relic, or very rough

and plain if the book was merely for the library. If only the original bindings were remaining on the *Book of Deer* or Queen Margaret's Gospel book! This latter book was itself preserved by a miracle, but the age of miracles is past, and the binding is gone.

If James I. had not died so inopportunely and thus prevented Aeneas Sylvius from going book hunting in Iona in search of the lost books of Livy, he might have returned with some volumes from that lost library, for he was not above using his high position to obtain presents of books. It is, however, useless to regret what is lost, rather make the most of what remains.

The most remarkable specimen of Scottish fifteenth century binding in existence, was described by Mr. Stevenson in the *Scottish Antiquary* (vol. xvi. pp. 133-9), and also in the *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society*. It is on a manuscript work on chivalry, translated, in 1456, from the French, by Sir Gilbert Hay at Roslyn and now in the library at Abbotsford. The binding is of brown calf, elaborately ornamented with designs built up from no less than thirty-three separate dies. The main design is a large parallelogram formed by lines, the portion inside the frame thus formed being filled with ornament. The centre panel is made up with small stamps representing the apostles, many used more than once. But the great importance of the binding, apart from its ornamental excellence, is the inscription made up by three dies, 'Patricius lowes me ligavit.' The use of these stamps shows that he was a professional binder, and a Patrick de Lowis was a burgess and had a house in Edinburgh between 1447 and 1466.

Another Scottish binding is on a volume containing some early printed books in the University Library, Cambridge. It is of stout black leather and the sides are divided by crossed lines into diamond-shaped compartments in each of which a conventional flower is stamped. The book belonged in 1475 to a certain Henry Barry, rector of Collace, and was by him given to the monastery at Dundee. This monastery which was founded in the fifteenth century was destroyed by the English in 1548. Later on it belonged to Sir Walter Ogilvy of Dunlugus and contains other Scottish names. It was described in the *Proceedings of the Edinburgh Bibliographical Society* by the Cambridge University librarian. On a copy of

part of the works of Aristotle, printed at Paris by W. Hopyl in 1501, in the University Library, St. Andrews, is a contemporary stamped binding almost certainly Scottish. The sides and back of the book are ornamented with small rough tools, while in the centre of each side is a small panel, about  $3\frac{1}{2}$  by  $2\frac{3}{4}$  inches, depicting the Crucifixion, with two women standing at the foot of the cross. The work is much simpler in style than is usual in such panels and the lines of the drapery are well designed and deeply cut. There is not, unfortunately, any binder's name or mark, but the similarity of the colour and texture of the leather, and of the shapes and designs of the small tools to what we find in other Scottish bindings, as well as the language and writing of the manuscript used to line the boards, all point to this being a genuine example of a native panel-stamped binding.

An interesting series of bindings, some perhaps of Scottish work, are preserved in the library of the Athenaeum Club, Liverpool. They are on a number of large legal folios, some containing two or even three volumes bound together. Their history is interesting, for they formed part of the loot carried off from Edinburgh after the capture of the city by the English in 1543. In most of the volumes is the following inscription: 'M<sup>d</sup> y<sup>t</sup> Edynborow was wone ye viii<sup>th</sup> daye off maye in año xxxvj. H. viii. et año dñi M<sup>cccc</sup>xluij<sup>o</sup> and y<sup>t</sup> y<sup>is</sup> Boke de decretales maximi was gott<sup>y</sup> and brought awaye from Edynborro forsaide by me Willm Norres of ye speike knygh<sup>t</sup> ye xj daye of maye in año sup'dit & now is ye Boke of me ye fouresaid sir Willm geuē and left by me for a nayreloume to remayne at speike in wittenes of ye same I have wret<sup>y</sup> ye same w<sup>t</sup> my none honde & subsc'bed my name. p me Willm Norres milit.'

What induced the worthy knight to loot immense volumes of *Panormitanus* on the *Decretals* and *Bartolus* on the *Digests* is a matter for wonder.

A number of the volumes belonged originally to Patrick Paniter, Abbot of Cambuskenneth. They bear the inscription, 'Liber magistri patricii paniter secretarii regii, oratoris lepidissimi,' which he could hardly have written himself. The volumes are generally reputed to have been taken from Holyrood, but as a Bible belonging to Alexander Mylne, Abbot of Cambuskenneth, to be noticed later, was part of the plunder, it would rather seem as though they were taken

from some house connected with Cambuskenneth, probably the Abbot's official residence in Edinburgh. The volumes remained in the Library of Speke Hall, near Liverpool, until the estate came into the hands of Topham Beauclerk, Johnson's friend, who sold the contents of the Hall about 1777. They were bought by a Liverpool solicitor, Henry Brown, and at his sale in 1825 by the Athenaeum. Though the volumes have suffered severely from former neglect, the greater portion of the original bindings remain. More recently they have suffered in another way, by being patched and repaired, and, as is usual in such cases, have been given new linings and fly-leaves, and every trace of original lining or inscriptions destroyed.

The following is a list of the books, which are all large folio :

Bartolus super, pp. 1, 2. Codicis. B. de Tortis. Venice, 1499.  
 Bartolus super, pp. 1, 2. Digest. Vet. B. de Tortis. Venice, 1499.  
 Bartolus super, pp. 1, 2. Infortiati. B. de Tortis. Venice, 1499-  
 1500.  
 Sandeus in Decretales. J. Sacon for J. Maillet. Lyons, 1500.  
 Justinianus. Digestum. J. Sibert. Lyons, 1500.  
 Bartolus super Digest Novo. [Venice, 1500.]  
 Panormitanus sup. libb. Decretalium. 4 vols. N. de Benedictis.  
 Lyons, 1500-01.  
 Justiniani Codex. Gering & Rembolt. Paris, 1505.  
 Gratiani Decretum. F. Fradin. Lyons, 1533.  
 Gregorii Decretum. F. Fradin. Lyons, 1533.  
 Libri sex decretalium.  
 Clementine.  
 Extravagantes Joannis. } F. Fradin. Lyons, 1535.

All these volumes are bound in dark calf ornamented with small dies, and I should consider all, with the exception of the four volumes of Bartolus, to have been bound abroad. These four volumes have no distinctive foreign dies or marks about them, but with the little knowledge we at present possess about Scottish bindings, they cannot be definitely pronounced Scottish. The tools used seem more clumsy and coarser than are found on foreign work, but have no individuality. The only large die which might be useful as giving a clue is one about an inch in height, diamond-shaped, containing the figure of a bird with outstretched wings (?eagle) and the name on a ribbon below Johannes. This occurs on the undated Bartolus, the only binding of which it can be said with certainty that it was not produced abroad.

There must have been plenty of binders in Edinburgh at this time. William Bonkill received in 1501 the sum of £6. 13s. 4d. for binding twenty-five volumes for the royal library. David Traill is also several times mentioned in the Lord High Treasurer's accounts as binding books for the king. At that time all stationers appear to have been bookbinders as well, and it is clear from several of the documents relating to the introduction and practice of the art of printing in Scotland that they were at that time numerous.

In Scotland the custom of putting marks of ownership on bindings began at a very early date. The earliest example which I have yet seen is on a book in my own collection, a copy of the *Institutes* of Justinian printed at Venice by John Hertzog in 1494. The binding, which is contemporary, is of brown calf, apparently of English or Scottish work, and at the top of the obverse cover is the impression of a stamp with the name in Gothic letter 'Auchinleck.' The background to the lettering has originally been decorated with water gilding, now almost disappeared. The stamp is certainly almost as old as the binding, and I am inclined to consider it as the ownership mark of the old family of Auchinleck of Auchinleck, who were the owners of the property before it came into the hands of the Boswells in 1504.

The earliest dated Scottish binding which I have seen was originally in the library of Alexander Mylne, Abbot of Cambuskenneth. He was the son of John Mylne, master-mason to the crown of Scotland, and was educated at St. Andrews, where he graduated in 1494. In 1517 he was appointed Abbot of Cambuskenneth and also master-mason to James V. In 1532 the king instituted the Court of Session as the central and supreme civil court for Scotland, and it was arranged that the president should be an ecclesiastic. Mylne presided over this court until his death in 1548, and was succeeded on February 24, 1549, by Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney. Mylne was a man of very great ability who did much to encourage learning, especially in theology, and he was the author of a history of the bishops of Dunkeld.

The book from his library is a copy of the Latin Bible printed by Stephanus at Paris in 1532. It is bound in dark calf, but has been rebacked. The binding is very plain, a centre panel formed by a narrow roll, with a small gilt ornament at each corner. Down the centre of the two sides

runs the inscription: R. P. ALLEX. ABB. CAMBUSKENNET VICECANCELLARII. REG. SCOTO, and at the head on each side is the date M.D.XXXIII.

This book like the others mentioned above formed part of the loot carried off from Edinburgh by Sir William Norris of Speke. It was found about 1853 in an old cottage at Childwall, near Liverpool, on property belonging to the Marquess of Salisbury. By him it was generously gifted to the library of the Athenaeum Club, Liverpool, where the rest of the Edinburgh volumes are preserved.

The earliest armorial binding I have yet seen is one produced for William Stewart, bishop of Aberdeen, who died in 1545. It is on a copy of *Cicero* printed by Hervagius at Basle in 1534, in my own collection, and is of brown calf with a broad blind tooled border round the side. The centre panel, formed by plain lines, is decorated at each corner with a large fleur-de-lys in gold, and in the centre is the bishop's armorial stamp, also in gold. This stamp, which is circular, measures three and a half inches in diameter and contains the bishop's arms in the centre, a fesse checky, over all a bandlet engrailed, surmounted by a mitre and the initials W.S. Round the whole is a very gracefully twisted ribbon with the motto 'Exultabo in Iesu meo.' There is nothing distinctive about the binding, which may well be Scottish work, but the stamp shows the influence of French taste. The relations at that time between France and Scotland were very intimate, and large numbers of Frenchmen worked in the eastern counties, so that the stamp may have been cut in Aberdeen or obtained by the bishop during one of his visits to France.

The example set by Bishop Stewart was soon followed, and in 1550 we come to the first dated armorial stamp, one of an interesting series. It is that of Henry Sinclair, dean of Glasgow and bishop of Ross, born in 1508. He was the second son of Sir Oliver Sinclair of Roslin. In 1550 he became dean of Glasgow and in August of the same year went to France, where he remained for some time. He was consecrated bishop of Ross in 1560, returned to France in 1564, and died there the year following.

The stamp, which is oval in shape, contains his arms, a cross engrailed with the motto below

ANEXOY KAI AIIEXOY.

Round the whole runs the inscription, 'Henricus Sinclar Decanus Glasguensis. 1550.'

In 1552 we find two more stamps, those of William Gordon, Bishop of Aberdeen, and James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow. The former was the fourth son of Alexander Gordon, third Earl of Huntley, and was educated at Aberdeen and Paris. On taking orders he was made Chancellor of Moray, and in 1546 was consecrated bishop of Aberdeen in succession to William Stewart. In the autumn of 1552 he was in Paris on public business. He died in 1577. His stamp, which is oval, contains a shield with his arms: (1) three boars' heads, (2) three lions' heads, (3) three crescents, (4) three cinquefoils. Above the shield is a mitre, and below, on a waving ribbon, the motto 'Sustine.'

Round all is the legend:

'GVILLIELMVS GORDONE ΕΠΙΣΚΟΠΟΣ ABERDONENSIS 1552.'

James Beaton, Archbishop of Glasgow, was the second son of John Bethune of Balfour, and was born in 1517. He was consecrated archbishop in 1552. He was educated in France, and paid it frequent visits. In 1570 he retired to France, taking with him the muniments and treasures of his diocese. He died in 1603 and left all his fortune and manuscripts to the Scots College at Paris. These valuable documents were removed to St. Omer at the outbreak of the Revolution, and have since been lost sight of. His book-stamp contains his arms, 1st and 4th a fesse between two lozenges or mascles (for Bethune), 2nd and 3rd a chevron (for Balfour?).

Below is the motto, *Ferendum ut vincas*, and round all the inscription:

'JACOBVS A BETOVN ARCHIEPISCOPVS GLASGVENSIS 1552.'

Next in order comes Andrew Durie, bishop of Galloway. He was a son of John Durie of Durie in Fife, and was made abbot of Melrose in 1526. In 1541 he was recommended for the See of Galloway, and in 1550 accompanied the Queen Regent to France. He died in Edinburgh in 1558 from a shock occasioned by a riot when the Protestants broke up the procession in honour of St. Giles. His oval stamp contains his arms, a chevron between three crescents on a shield surmounted by a mitre; below on a ribbon is the motto 'Adveniat,' and round all the inscription:

'ANDREAS DVRII EPISCOPVS CANDIDECASE 1554.'

The last dated stamp in this series is that of Robert Reid, bishop of Orkney. He was a son of John Reid of Aikenhead, and was educated at St. Andrews. In 1528 he was made abbot of Kinloss, and in 1541 bishop of Orkney. In 1549 he succeeded Alexander Mylne as president of the Court of Session. In 1558 he was sent to the court of France, but died at Dieppe in September of that year. He built in 1538 the library of the abbey of Kinloss, and bequeathed eight thousand marks for the founding of a college in Edinburgh.

His stamp consists of a shield surmounted by a mitre, bearing his arms, a stag's head, couped. Below is the motto 'Moderate,' and round all the inscription :

'ROBERTVS REID EPVS ORCHADEN ET ABBAS A KYNLOS 1558.'

This stamp is reproduced in Stuart's *Records of the Monastery of Kinloss*.

One other stamp, of the same style and period as the last five, is without date. It is that of Archibald Craufurd, canon of Glasgow. In the centre is a shield with the arms, a fesse ermine, in base a fleur-de-lys, below on a ribbon the motto EKΩΝ ΚΑΚΟΠΑΘΩΝ, and round all the inscription :

'ARCHIBALDV S CRAVFVRD CANONICVS GLASGVE.'

These six stamps are all very similar in style and appearance, and might almost be considered the work of one hand. It will be noticed that the dates of these stamps generally coincide with the period of a visit of their owners to France, and it may be that these dies were engraved for them in Paris. They do not, however, resemble in any way any Continental examples, nor do we find dated stamps used so early abroad. Their oval shape and small size gives them a great resemblance to the ordinary Episcopal seals, from which it is quite likely that they were copied. All these six examples I found on books in the St. Andrews University Library, but it seems that the use of these stamps was popular, and a search through other libraries may probably bring other examples to light.

Adam Bothwell, bishop of Orkney, had a book-stamp, which may be in this style, though slightly later. I have not yet been able to come across an example.

The bindings produced for Mary Queen of Scots are of the very greatest rarity, and as might be expected are mostly of French workmanship. One, belonging to Lord Rosebery,

on a copy of Paradin's *Chronique de Savoie*, is of plain calf with a panel made by a blind-tooled roll. Her arms are in the centre, and the crowned M occurs on the sides and back. The *Ptolemy* of 1490, mentioned in the inventory of 1569, is now in the British Museum. This beautiful book is in olive morocco, richly decorated, with the combined monogram of Francis II. and Mary. A special monograph on this binding with a facsimile was issued by the Bibliographical Society in 1901. An undoubted Scottish specimen of her binding is preserved in the British Museum. It is on a copy of the 'Black Acts,' printed at Edinburgh by Robert Lekprevik in 1566, and is of dark brown calf. Each side has a deep, richly gilt border enclosing the arms of the Queen. These have been at one time coloured, the arms in red, the unicorn supporters in white, but the paint has been mostly rubbed away. Below the shield hangs the order of St. Andrew, and above all, on a ribbon, the motto 'In defens.' At the sides, on small ribbons, are the words 'Maria Regina.' The design is an exact copy of the woodcut on the title page, which was first used by Thomas Davidson in his edition of the *New Actis* of 1540.

Another collector whose bindings show evidence of great taste was Mary's brother, James Stewart, but, as with Mary's, the majority were probably executed in France. The sides have generally the Lion of Scotland stamped in the centre of the sides, surrounded by a wreath of most delicate design. The name Jacobus Steward is also stamped on the sides, with the letters below c.p.s. (custos privati sigilli), accompanied by the motto SALVS PER XPM, or in some cases IN SPE CONTRA SPEM, with the initials I.S.

James VI. was a liberal patron of bookbinders, and in July, 1581, appointed John Gibson as Royal bookbinder with a yearly salary of £20 Scots. A bill for binding books for the king sent in by Gibson in October, 1580, affords some clue to style and prices. Octavos, 'gilt,' presumably bound in calf, cost ten shillings, and the cheapest as well as most frequently used binding was parchment, which cost for an octavo three shillings. Vellum was a favourite binding, a fashion probably introduced from Holland. The few specimens that remain from the library of William Ramsay show that he was a lover of fine bindings. He was the principal of St. Salvator's College in St. Andrews from 1566 to 1570,

and some of his books are on the shelves of the University Library. In some ways the work done for him is very similar to that done for the famous collector Marc Lauwin of Watervliet, near Bruges. Both admired delicate Renaissance designs, very graceful but perfectly simple, and used very sparingly. Both too placed their names on the covers, Ramsay in the form of Gulielmus Ramasaeus or Guliel. Ramusius. One of his bindings has an ornament worked out in black enamel or paint, the design on another is tooled in silver. A little die with the head of Dido is also found. Why Dido should have been so popular with bookbinders is not easy to explain, but she is found on bindings by Berthelet, on some made for Sir Thomas Wotton, on the beautiful vellum copy of Boece's *Chronicles* bound for James V., now in the library of Mr. J. Pierpont Morgan, and on other miscellaneous bindings. This binding of James V. is a remarkably rich and highly ornamented piece of work which a recent writer rather daringly describes as 'purely Scottish,' though he qualifies the assertion by adding 'although the tools for doing it must have been procured in France, or from Italy through France.' It is worth noting that another copy of the *Chronicles*, on vellum, now in the library of Ham House, has also the King's name stamped upon the binding.

Two Nicols, apparently father and son, appear to have been great collectors. James, the earlier, was a notary who flourished in the second half of the sixteenth century. A copy of Beza's *Tractationes Theologicae*, Geneva, 1573, in my collection, belonged to him. It is in the original Scottish binding, blind-tooled, with a broad handsome roll. On the fly-leaf are the inscriptions: 'Empt 15 sh.'; 'Ex libris Jacobi Nicolaidis'; 'Principium sapientiae timor domini'; and lower down, in the same hand, but later, 'Non est mortale quod opto,' a motto found also stamped on the bindings of the great collector Paul Petau.

On the title-page is the autograph of Thomas Nicolson, and his motto, 'Pacem Jehovah negat impiis.' At the foot of the page is his printed book-plate with the inscription, surrounded by a border of type ornament:

M<sup>R</sup> THOMAS NICOLSON

COM. 1610. ABD.

This is apparently the earliest genuine dated Scottish book-plate, and if produced in Aberdeen, as seems probable, is the earliest dated specimen of printing in that town. Another book in my collection, And. Tiraquellus, *De legibus connubialibus*, Lyons, 1560, has also on the title-page his name, motto, and book-plate. The binding is of brown calf, with a little gilt ornament, and in the centre of each cover, Nicolson's book-stamp in gold. In the centre, between the initials M.T.N., is a shield with his arms, presumably a lion's head between three birds' heads (falcons). Below the shield are the words 'Com. Abd.,' and round all the motto 'Pacem Jehovah negat impiis.' Of this stamp he had two varieties, a small one about an inch and a half high, and a second about double the size.

This Thomas Nicolson was 'commissarius' of Aberdeen up to at least 1615, and is probably identical with the professor of Civil Law at Aberdeen of the same name in 1619. In 1622 he purchased the estate of Cockburnspath, near Edinburgh, which was inherited by his son James in 1625.

When his library was dispersed is not known. The first of the books mentioned above contains the autographs 'Strathmore' and 'Lady Grisall Lyon,' and the book-plate of the Right Hon<sup>ble</sup>. John Earl of Strathmore, while the initials I.L. are stamped in gold on the covers. The second book has on the back of the title-page the book-plate of 'The Hon<sup>ble</sup> S<sup>r</sup> Andrew Hume. 1707.'

A very neat small stamp occurring on bindings of the early seventeenth century is that of T. Henrison. It is oval in shape, a coat of arms in the centre; three piles issuant from the dexter, on the sinister side a cinquefoil; a chief divided per fesse, and in the lower half thereof a crescent between two ermine spots.

The initials T.H. are at each side and a helmet above. Round all runs the motto 'Quid retribuam Domino. Henrison.' This I take to be the device of Thomas Henrison, son of the famous Scottish judge Edward Henrison, and his wife Helen Swinton. He became a Lord of Session in June, 1622, as Lord Chesters, and was knighted. In 1633 he was a commissioner for revising the laws and collecting local customs. In 1637 he resigned his appointments, and died 3rd February, 1638. Henrison appears to have been a benefactor to the library of the University of St. Andrews, where a number of

his books are preserved, though some are scattered. This custom of stamping arms on plain bindings became very widespread during the seventeenth century, and no doubt a careful search would bring many to light. Sir Robert Kerr, afterwards Lord Ancrum, a man of considerable literary taste and ability, and a friend of Drummond of Hawthornden and John Donne, was in the habit of having his bindings so ornamented.

Sir William Bruce of Kinross, architect to Charles II. and restorer of Holyrood, was second son of Robert Bruce of Blairhall, and was born early in the seventeenth century. He appears to have been a book-collector, as his arms are found on a number of bindings. Many of the coats-of-arms, crests or badges found on bindings of this period are exceedingly difficult to identify absolutely, or to allocate to particular members of a family. It is a matter for regret that no one has yet been found to do for the United Kingdom what M. Guigard has done for France by the publication of his invaluable work, the *Armorial du Bibliophile*. In it he gives a reproduction of every known French armorial stamp, with a short notice of the more important collectors and a note on their libraries. The want of such a guide has long been felt in England, and though several people have been at work collecting material for a considerable number of years, nothing has hitherto resulted. The number, variety and historical interest of native bindings of this class, would come as a great surprise to all collectors who have not studied the subject very intimately, or visited many of the older libraries.

It is probable that when more attention has been paid to the bindings of the books in the older Scottish libraries, and the subject more carefully studied, we may be able with some accuracy to fix on distinctive marks, in workmanship and in decoration, which will enable us to separate Scottish work from all other. There was not, as in England after 1534, any law prohibiting the importation of bound books, so that the native binder would have much less work at any rate in the earlier period. A glance, however, through the notes on printers and stationers appended to Mr. Aldis' 'List of books printed in Scotland before 1700,' shows that binders were numerous; even Perth had its own bookbinder, William Lauder, as early as 1591. When so much was produced, a certain amount must still be preserved, and all this needs to

be examined. In the case of old collections, whether public or private, it often happens that accounts of payments for binding have been preserved, and by their means the work of individual binders can be determined. In this manner Mr. Gibson was able to identify the work of all the binders employed by the Bodleian from its foundation, and allocate their work at a glance.

The last years of the seventeenth century saw an entire change come over Scottish binding, and when the Act of Union was passed there was firmly established in Scotland one of the most distinctive schools of binding that has ever existed. Crude perhaps in design and often careless in detail, the general effect is very rich. The leather used was excellent both in texture and colour, and the gilding well applied. There was perhaps too much gilding, but this was a natural reaction from earlier severity, and the result is effective. This work, however, is beyond the scope of the present article.

E. GORDON DUFF.

## The Roman Fort at Newstead

### Traces of Successive Occupations

IN the majority of Roman forts which have been excavated there are signs of change and alteration, foundations of abandoned buildings, traces of older occupations. To unravel the meaning of these changes, to penetrate the story of advance and retreat which they suggest is a fascinating problem. At an early stage of the work at Newstead it was noted that at least two occupations had to be dealt with. The foundations of the long buildings in the southwest angle of the fort lying on disturbed soil gave the first indication; the discovery of the early ditch lying beneath the clay rampart of the later occupation confirmed it. It was only, however, when the central buildings came to be dealt with that alterations were noted which pointed to three, and possibly four, reconstructions of the fort, each of which suggested a distinct period of occupation.

The Newstead fort was of the usual rectangular form, greater in length than in breadth. It was cut into two unequal portions by the Via Principalis, the main street running north and south, which in the latest period of the occupation so divided the area that roughly one-third of the whole extent lay to the east and two-thirds to the west. The general scheme of the ground-plan appears to have been to allot two-thirds of the area to barracks or workshops, and one-third to stores and administrative buildings. The latter occupied the middle section of the fort, and in the centre stood the building commonly known as the Praetorium, entering from the Via Principalis and facing the east. This building was of the normal type. It consisted of an outer courtyard with an ambulatory on three sides, and an inner courtyard, entering from which, and placed against the west or back wall of the building, were five

chambers. On this building there were alterations which undoubtedly belonged to a later date, suggesting two periods of occupation. There had been thrown over the Via Principalis in front, a long building or hall, a feature common in the German Limes forts, and known in these as an 'Exerzierhalle.' That this was of later date was shown by the shallowness of its foundations, which lay at a higher level than those of the main building. There had also been constructed a treasure vault in the central of the five chambers. Such vaults have been noted as later additions at Cilurnum, at Aesica, and at Butzbach in Germany. It was plainly a late addition here. It was inserted into the floor in irregular fashion. Its foundations were lower than those of the chamber, and in laying them the cobble foundations of the main walls had been laid bare.

In its clay floor were remains of older material, a roofing tile, the upper stone of a quern, and the handle of an amphora with the stamp **SER-B**. Further, the wall dividing the outer from the inner court lay on disturbed soil, and the position of the pillars of the outer court on the south side showed signs of alteration. It seemed quite plain that we had here two distinct occupations, in both of which the building had been entered from the same main street on the east.

To neither of these occupations could the early system of ditches belong. Not only did the ramparts of later occupations lie above them, but the barrack buildings at the east were built over them. The entrances of the earliest fort are distinguished from the later gates by a curious adaptation of the clavricula, specimens of which may be seen in the plans of some of Caesar's forts in Gaul, and in the recently excavated fort at Kneblinghausen in Germany. The south gate of this earliest fort lay almost at the end of the later Via Quintana, the street, which running parallel to the Via Principalis, crossed the fort immediately to the west of the Praetorium. We were thus in possession of distinct evidence of three occupations, but so far no evidence was forthcoming to show why, in strengthening the fortifications, the line of the early entrance to the south had been abandoned, and the line of the Via Principalis moved further to the east.

The first definite evidence of four occupations was obtained in the excavation of the gates on the south side. At the end of the Via Principalis it was found that the ditches had



PLAN OF THE ROMAN MILITARY STATION AT NEWSTEAD.

By Mr. Thomas Ross, Architect.



been filled in with river stones to allow the road to pass over them. In the large inner ditch nine feet of black silt lay below the cobbles. It was clear from this that at an earlier period the ditch at this point must have been open, and that it must either have been crossed by a drawbridge, or there existed elsewhere another entrance in substitution for which the road had been formed by filling up the ditch. As two occupations had evidently used the *Via Principalis*, and consequently crossed the ditches at this point, this earlier entrance, if it existed, must have marked an occupation intervening between the earliest with its clavicular gateways, and the two later occupations, an occupation in which the great strengthening of the defences had taken place, and in which the road doubtless passed out on solid ground. Careful search revealed no trace of a drawbridge, but an examination of the ground at the south end of the *Via Quintana* brought to light the heavy bottoming of a road crossing the early ditch and passing beneath the rampart, but which disappeared above the later ditches. Here then was the position of the earlier gateway we were in search of. It was indeed natural that it should be so, as the main road from the south in the earliest occupation had entered almost at this point. The disappearance of the road over the later ditches proved that with the formation of the gate at the end of the *Via Principalis* this gate had been closed and the ditches carried through the roadway. The position of the earlier gate was further confirmed by the examination of the double ditches surrounding the annex to the south. Here the road from the *Via Quintana* passed out on solid ground, the ditches stopping on either side, while the road from the *Via Principalis* was carried over ditches which had been filled up with river stones. It was thus apparent that after the abandonment of the earliest fort there came a second occupation in which the *Via Principalis* ran on the line of the later *Quintana*.

The general plan of a Roman fort was laid out on certain well-recognized lines. In every rectangular fort of the type of Newstead there were at least four gates, one on each side. The position of these gates governed the position of the buildings in the interior. The *Praetorium* was placed as near as possible to the centre. It stood midway between two of the gates, facing one of them. The road traversing the fort between the two remaining gates passed in front of it. An exception to

this rule occurs in the fort at South Shields, but there is reason to suppose that there, the position of the Praetorium is due to an enlargement of the fort in which the gates had been altered and the building left in its old position.

Now, if we apply this rule to the second occupation at Newstead, the line of road traversing the fort from north to south makes it practically certain that the central building, in order to occupy its usual position, must have faced the west, following no doubt in this the position of the same building in the earliest occupation. The strong buttressed building lying immediately to the south of the Praetorium faced the west. It was a well-built structure, showing no signs of reconstruction. The level of the roads at either end seemed to have risen against it, indicating that it belonged to an early period. It did not, however, belong to the earliest occupation of all, as the walls of a large building were found partly beneath it. These walls corresponded in alignment and in method of construction with early walls lying at the east end of the Praetorium, and which had been cut through in laying its foundations. It is probable that these early walls belonged to the first occupation of the fort, the central buildings of which faced the west; that the south buttressed building belonged to the second occupation, and with the Praetorium had faced the west in that occupation, but that in the third and fourth occupations the latter had been reversed, probably without any alteration of the foundations of its main walls. In connection with this change the position of the small square building in the outer courtyard of the Praetorium is of importance. It did not appear to belong to the last occupation, and it is not impossible that it formed the Sacellum during the second occupation.

Nothing as yet had emerged to give a reason for the changes of the ground plan indicated above. A fortunate discovery, however, threw light upon the question. In endeavouring to clear up some details of the barrack buildings on the west side of the fort excavated in 1905, the foundations of a heavy wall, six feet in thickness, were met with, running north and south, parallel to and about seventy feet from the west side of the Via Quintana. The foundation was of river stones bedded in clay two feet deep, on which at one part lay a course of heavy blocks of hammer-dressed sandstone. A well-built drain running to the west was found passing out beneath

it. Tracing the wall to the line of the main road issuing to the west, the foundations of two guard chambers were discovered. Of these nothing but the cobble foundations remained, but they must have been of great strength, especially in front, where they projected beyond the line of the wall. The road passing out between them was nine feet in width. No ditch was found in front of the wall. The purpose for which it had been erected was evidently to cut off a portion of the area of the fort. This area is the lowest and wettest portion, and the black, peaty matter which lies over it would suggest that at one time it was flooded. In extent it measures about one-third of the whole area, and its abandonment would appear to indicate a definite period of occupation. With the reduction in the size of the fort the existing lines of road were not in accordance with the recognised plan. The street, which was the earlier *Via Principalis*, no longer formed the central artery of communication, and a *Praetorium* facing the west, with its entrance close to the new western gate, was no longer in its proper central position. The position of the north and south gates must therefore have been altered to the east, and with them the line of the *Via Principalis*; and we may safely infer that with this change of gates the *Praetorium* underwent alteration and was turned round.

As already noted the alterations of the *Praetorium* had convinced us that the building had during two occupations faced the east. The discovery of the wall reducing the size of the fort gave further confirmation to this opinion, as not only were its gate towers buried beneath the gravel road of the last occupation, but buildings and drains evidently of later construction lay in the area which had been formerly abandoned.

The method of foundation employed in the later occupations lent itself to reconstruction on the old lines. A trench was carried down to the subsoil, and in it large river stones were laid in puddled clay. This formed a base indestructible by fire or weather, and, provided the outline and size of the building remained the same, it might be used for several rebuildings. Unfortunately, at Newstead the demolition has been so complete that doorways, with a single exception, were entirely obliterated, and with them many details which would have rendered it more easy to follow the various reconstructions. The north buttressed building appeared to be an example of this rebuilding on an old foundation. Below lay the heavy

blocks of river stone embedded in clay, above them inferior masonry, in which lay a broken Andernach quern stone, bricks, and other old material. It was interesting to compare this with the remains of the south buttressed building, in which, although the foundations were the same, the superstructure was of well-built hammer-dressed sandstone. No doubt the size of these storehouse buildings was proportionate to the extent of the fort. It is probable that both were erected in the second occupation, but that with the restriction of area of the third occupation the northern building was dismantled, to be again rebuilt when the size of the fort was once more increased. The retention of the south building is easy to understand, it would lie nearer to cultivated ground, for we may assume on the fertile slopes to the south patches of corn in the clearings, and to the highway that linked the garrison to civilization and to Rome.

The several phases of occupation at Newstead would thus appear to have been—*First*, a fort with an earthen rampart, probably strengthened by a palisade defended by a single ditch, except along the west front, where the ditches were doubled. *Second*, an occupation characterised by a slight increase of area and greatly increased strength, fortified by a rampart and triple ditches. Whether a wall formed part of the defence in this occupation is uncertain. *Third*, an occupation marked by a restriction of the size of the fort and the construction of the wall parallel to the *Via Quintana*. And *Fourth*, a return to the area of the second occupation, in which the fort was surrounded by a rampart faced with a wall seven feet six inches thick, and triple ditches.

To the west of the fort lies a fortified annex, which has been partly investigated. It would be unwise to draw definite conclusions from the amount of work that has so far been done upon it. There are, however, indications that it may confirm the results obtained in the main area. Its ditches appear to have no connection with the ditches of the first occupation of the fort, but its single block of buildings would appear to show evidence of different periods of occupation. In the first of these the building was of great size, about 300 feet in length. At a subsequent period the annex was very materially reduced in extent, a ditch cutting the building in two, and a structure appears to have been raised over the portion nearest the fort, thus corresponding with the restriction of the third occupation.



IRON HELMET WITH IRON FACE MASK

Page 448

en  
p  
d  
o  
ta  
h  
T  
f  
k  
s  
r  
t  
c  
l  
r  
l  
I  
r  
v  
c  
j  
v  
c  
f  
l

It is to be regretted that little has been found which enables us to fix with any certainty the limits of the various periods of occupation of the fort. With the exception of the dedication to Jupiter by a centurion of the XXth Legion on the altar found in the Praetorium, the inscriptions are but tantalizing fragments which tell us nothing. Two points in its history may, however, even now be given with some certainty. The fort was occupied in the first century, and in all probability formed a stage in the advance of Agricola into the north. The latest occupation did not extend beyond the limits of the second century. For proof of these conclusions we must rely upon the finds of coins and pottery. The ditches of the earliest fort belonged only to one period. At the close of that period they were for the most part sealed up by the later ramparts placed above them. It followed then that the relics which they contained could not belong to any period later than the commencement of the second occupation. Portions of this ditch have been cleared out and more remains to be done. The objects recovered from it are not very numerous, but they are sufficiently suggestive. They consist of a bronze stylus, a fibula, the handle of a bronze jug, five coins, some glass and pottery, and a human skull. Of the coins, one dates from Vespasian, one belongs to either Vespasian or Titus, and two to Domitian; the latest in date of these was struck in the year 86 A.D. A coin of Titus was found in the clay filling above the ditch.

The pottery represented fragments of some twenty-five to thirty vessels, for the most part of Samian ware, thin and hard baked, of a dark red colour, with a bright glaze. The only decorated bowl approaching completeness was one of the type known to archaeologists as number 30 in the classification of Dragendorff. Below the usual egg and dart moulding run a series of panels in the form of arches. The designs which fill these are alternately an eagle standing over a hare, with lines of arrow points below it, and a draped female figure walking to the left. Her chin is supported by her right hand, while her left supports her elbow. In front of her rises a conventional tree. The figure is identified by Déchelette in his *Vases céramiques ornés de la Gaule Romaine* as a figure of Penelope. It has been found at Cabeza del Griego, Spain, on a bowl made at La Graufesenque, and I have noted it on fragments from Montans in the museum of Toulouse. The eagle also

450      The Roman Fort at Newstead

appears to be a design from La Graufesenque. Most of the remaining decorated fragments can be identified as emanating from the same pottery, and among the undecorated pottery, both of Samian and coarser wares, there are types which are to be met with in the early fort of Hofheim near Wiesbaden, the abandonment of which has been fixed about the year A.D. 60. I have not found any pottery which appears to belong to Lezoux, and it therefore seems probable that the undecorated Samian came from La Graufesenque. These facts would point to the abandonment of the ditch before the end of the first century. It is interesting to note as bearing upon the line of Agricola's route to the north that the collection of Samian ware obtained in the excavation of Birrens contains no early pieces. On the other hand, the early types were common at Camelon with later pottery. Both early and late occur at Ardoch, while the few fragments found at Inchtuthill, both of Samian and coarser ware, appear to belong without exception to the period of the first occupation of Newstead.

That the latest occupation cannot have been prolonged much beyond the end of the second century may be inferred from the series of coins found. These number about one hundred and fifty, and have been picked up, not in hoards, be it noted, but scattered up and down over the fort. The earliest coin is a denarius of Rome of the year 132 B.C. Next comes a coin of the Vibian family of 43 B.C., followed by a number of the legionary denarii of Mark Antony. The Imperial series begins with a single coin of Augustus, while from Nero to Marcus Aurelius the succession is almost complete, the earlier coins preponderating. The latest coin found is a denarius of Crispina, the wife of Commodus, 180-192 A.D.

JAMES CURLE.



BRONZE EWER, 11" IN HEIGHT



FOUR PIONEERS' AXES

Page 450



## Reviews of Books

A SHORT ACCOUNT OF THE AFFAIRS OF SCOTLAND IN THE YEARS 1744, 1745, 1746. By David, Lord Elcho. Printed from the Original Manuscript at Gosford, with a Memoir and Annotations by the Hon. Evan Charteris. Pp. x, 477. Demy 8vo. Edinburgh: David Douglas. 1907. 15s. nett.

AMONG the contributions that have been made to Jacobite literature in recent years, Lord Elcho's narrative is certainly the most interesting, and perhaps the most important. To some extent its contents are familiar; for Sir Walter Scott was privileged to use it for the narrative of the '45 in his *Tales of a Grandfather*, and to annotate his text with quotations from it. It has been reserved for Mr. Charteris to reveal the full interest of his kinsman's narrative. He has edited it with great care and judgment, and has appended a memoir of Lord Elcho, which is so full, so interesting, and so deftly composed, that its publication as a separate monograph would have been amply justified. It presents an interesting picture of the roving life on the Continent to which many of the unfortunate adherents of Prince Charles were condemned.

Elcho's first meeting with the Prince was at Paris in February, 1744. Charles had just arrived from Rome, in obedience to an invitation from Louis XV. to accompany the French expedition resolved upon tardily in the previous autumn. Charles was lodging in Lord Sempill's house. 'I found the Prince,' says Elcho, 'all alone in his chamber, drinking tea. He opened the door for me, and shut it himself, and seemed very uneasy.' Charles detailed his plans, and handed to Elcho a commission as Colonel of Dragoons in an army yet unrecruited. The battering of the French transports at Dunkirk, and the abandonment of the expedition (March, 1744), cheated Elcho of military adventure. He returned to Scotland, spent a convivial evening with the astute Andrew Fletcher, and disarmed suspicion by representing himself as an unwilling spectator of the recent preparations at Dunkirk, impatiently seeking a passage from a country which was meditating war against his own. As the guest of his brother-in-law, Sir James Steuart of Goodtrees, Elcho continued to be in touch with Jacobite intrigues, which Charles's presence in France had stimulated to fresh activity. In July, 1744, Elcho accompanied Murray of Broughton to the Continent, and took part in the military movements in the Low Countries, while Murray proceeded to Paris to interview Charles. In October, 1744, Murray and Elcho returned to Scotland with communications from Charles to his supporters, and founded the 'Buck Club' at Edinburgh to bring the party together. Whether Murray encouraged

Charles's rash adventure in 1745 by false or exaggerated statements of the resources and spirit of the Scottish Jacobites is a moot point. 'Most of the gentlemen of that party look'd upon it as a mad project, and were utterly against it,' writes Elcho. He adds: 'Mr. Murray and some others who were in desperate circumstances certainly encouraged the Prince underhand.' Murray's own account in his *Memorials* is familiar, and our knowledge of Charles's headstrong character makes it not improbable that the Prince required no 'underhand' encouragement. It is material also to observe, though a majority of the 'Buck Club' represented to Charles through Traquair that to raise the standard without several thousand troops and money from France would ruin the cause and its supporters in Scotland, Elcho gives a formidable list of members of the Club who were prepared to join Charles in any event. They were twenty-one in number, and included the chiefs of the clans which bore the brunt of the rising. Elcho himself was, and remained, among those who deprecated rash and hazardous adventure. It was a party with which Charles was never in touch, and his amazing success up to the catastrophe of Culloden held him yet wider aloof from it.

Early in 1745 young Glengarry—'Pickle'—was sent over to France. Elcho suspects him of having 'represented every body that had ever spoke warmly of the Stuart family as people that would certainly join him if he came.' In June, 1745, Sir Hector Maclean of Duart arrived in Scotland with letters from Charles, announcing his imminent arrival, and desiring, 'if possible, all the castles and fortress's in Scotland might be taken before his arrival!' 'Every body,' writes Elcho, 'was vastly alarm'd at this news, and were determin'd when he came to endeavour all in their power to prevail upon him to go back.' Towards the end of June Charles embarked on board the 'Du Teillay' 'at a Villadge call'd la Vrai Croix, a little below Pleinbeuf at the Embouchure of The Loire.' On July 23 he arrived at Eriskay. Elcho makes a statement, which is not supported elsewhere, that Charles was at once met by a messenger from Macdonald of Sleat and Macleod of Macleod advising him to abandon a 'bad project,' and that his companions were 'all for Going back again to France, except Sir Thomas Sheridan. Even the Prince himself seemed for it, but Sir Thomas persuaded him to remain.'

Elcho joined Charles on September 16, the day before the Prince's entry into Edinburgh. He was a wealthy and therefore welcome recruit. Besides a thousand pounds of his own, he had obtained fifteen hundred guineas from his brother, and offered them to Charles upon learning that his funds were reduced to less than fifty guineas. He dunned Charles persistently and unsuccessfully for their return in the years to come. From Charles's entry into Edinburgh until Culloden, Elcho played an active part in the Rising as Colonel of a troop of gentlemen Life-guards, and as a member of the Prince's Council. His 'Short Account' is therefore of first-hand authority. To Holyrood there came 'many Ladies of Fashion to Kiss his [Charles's] hand, but his behaviour to them was very Cool: he had not been much used to Womens Company, and was always embarrassed while he was with them.' After Cope's defeat Charles

'lay always in the Camp [at Duddingston] and never Strip'd. He used to come into town early and Assemble his Council ; after that he dined with his principal officers in publick. After dinner he road out with his Guards and review'd his Army, Came back and sup'd in town, and after Supper went and Sleep'd in the Camp.' When in residence at Holyrood, Charles lived 'with Great Splendour and Magnificence,' dined in public before a crowd of spectators, and usually 'their was musick at Supper, and a ball afterwards.'

Of Prestonpans Elcho gives a clear and spirited account. He mentions the random and irresponsible shooting by the Highlanders on their march thither of all the ill-omened pigs and hares they encountered, of which they killed several 'to the great risk of Everybody that was near.' The somewhat complicated movement by which Lord George Murray converted his left of the previous day into his right as he descended to meet Cope, is explained by Elcho as 'done in order to Give the Macdonalds who were on the left the right.' The battle, says Elcho, confirming other accounts, 'did not last full a quarter of an hour.' 'The Prince,' he remarks, 'from this Battle entertained a mighty notion of the Highlanders, and ever after imagin'd they would beat four times their number of regular troops.' He formed an equally profound conviction 'That the regular troops would not fight against him, and that all England was in there hearts Convinced of his just right, and in consequence for him ; so he thought that he had nothing to do but to appear and Succeed.' With such boundless optimism, based upon inexperience, Charles prepared to enter England.

Other prejudices weighed with Charles to render him impatient of the cautions which Lord George Murray and Elcho addressed to him against rash adventure. He had been brought up to regard 'the Hanover Family as Cruel Tyrants hated by every body, and only kept possession of the crown because they had enslaved the people ; and that if he or any of his Family were ever to appear in Britain, that they would flock to him and Look upon him as their deliverer and help him to chase away the Usurpers family.' Hence 'it was no wonder,' Elcho comments, 'his Council sometimes differ'd from him in opinion.' In regard to the march into England, Charles was immovable : 'I find, gentlemen, you are for staying in Scotland and defending your Country, and I am resolved to Go to England,' he persisted after several debates. Elcho supports Lord George Murray in representing that the Cumberland-Lancashire route was a compromise between these extremes. The army that adventured it, according to Elcho's exact figures, numbered 4000 foot, 500 horse, and 13 cannon, the heaviest of the cannon being four-pounders.

Charles's reception at Manchester, the first encouragement he had received in England, confirmed him in the certainty of his success. 'His Conversation that Night at Table,' says Elcho, 'was, in what manner he should enter London, on horseback or a foot, and in what dress.' But Elcho confirms Maxwell of Kirkconnell's supposition that as early as at Manchester Lord George was anxious to retreat. 'The Principal officers of the Army,' Elcho writes, 'mett at Manchester, and

were of Opinion that now they had marched far enough into England, and as they had received not the least Encouragement from any person of distinction, the French not landed, and only joined by 200 [Manchester] vagabonds, they had done their part ; and as they did not pretend to put a King upon the throne of England without their consent, that it was time to represent to the Prince to go back to Scotland. But after talking a great deal about it, it was determin'd to March to Derby, that so neither the French nor the English might have it to Say, the army had not marched far Enough into England to give the one Encouragement to Land and the other to join.' Five days later, at five o'clock on the morning following the army's arrival at Derby, Lord George and 'all the Commanders of Battalions and Squadrons' waited upon the Prince. Lord George told him that 'it was the opinion of Every body present that the Scots had now done all that could be Expected of them.' They had gone far enough to encourage the French, far enough to hearten the English Jacobites to action. But the French had landed no force in England, and the English Jacobites not only had not risen, but had not even held communication with them. To proceed in the face of such apathy was madness. Suppose they evaded or conquered Cumberland's army and the reserves on Finchley Common, 'the success of the Affair would intirely depend upon the [London] mobs declaring for or against it, and that if the mob had been much inclined to his cause since his March into England, that to be sure some of his friends in London would have fall'n upon some method to have lett him Know'n it, but if the Mob was against the Affair 4500 men would not make a great figure in London.' Lord George concluded by stating the objects of the expedition : (1) to encourage the English Jacobites to rise ; (2) to join the French if they landed. The first had not risen : and the French had already landed in Scotland. 'Certainly,' Lord George added, '4500 Scots had never thought of putting a King upon the English Throne by themselves.' Elcho's account here is most valuable. It gives what is obviously the précis of Lord George's speech, and confirms and expands Lord George's own brief account. It contradicts Hay of Restalrig's account (printed in Horne's *History*), and supports Charles's own emphatic denial of the accuracy of that account. Charles listened to the arguments of Murray and others 'with the greatest impatience, fell into a passion, and gave most of the Gentlemen that had Spoke very Abusive Language.' After twelve hours conversation, however, Charles 'sent for them, and told them he consented to go to Scotland, And at the same time he told them that for the future he would have no more Councils, for he would neither ask nor take their Advice ; that he was Accountable to nobody for his Actions, but to his Father.' Save once, on the day after the retreat from Stirling, in February, 1746, Charles kept to his resolution.

The remainder of Elcho's narrative is not less interesting, but calls for less notice. Regarding the proposed stand at Lancaster on the retreat to Scotland, Elcho states that it was the proposal of the 'principal officers,' and that it was made among other reasons to test whether 'it was great

Stoutness or Contradiction that made the Prince and his Irish favourites for Stoping in Every town.' Elcho states that Charles consented, and allowed Lord George 'to reconnoitre a field of Battle.' It is not clear from Elcho's narrative why the idea of giving battle to Cumberland at Lancaster was abandoned. The garrisoning of Carlisle, a senseless sacrifice of devoted men, naturally has Elcho's condemnation. It was 'done against the opinion almost of Everybody,' he remarks. Lord George Murray and Maxwell of Kirkconnell concur. Of the circumstances under which the retreat from Stirling was conducted Elcho is equally condemnatory. His narrative of Culloden and its preliminaries is full and vivid. Regarding Charles's unfortunate neglect to appoint a *rendezvous* in case of defeat, Elcho comments: 'The Prince was so far from thinking of retreating that he would have taken it much Amiss if any body had doubted so far of a Victory as to have ask'd him where the army should rendezvous in Case of a defeat, and for the only reason of their [the enemy's] not daring to face their righteous [sic] Prince.'

There is no indication of the date when Elcho's narrative was composed. His relations with Charles in later years lay it under suspicion of bias. On the other hand, Charles's character as it unfolded itself in the dull days of inaction in Italy and elsewhere, offers no evidence that Elcho's picture of him in 1745-46 is other than shrewd and sound. Commenting on the Rising, Elcho remarks: 'What displeased the people of fashion was that he did not Seem to have the least Sense of what they had done for him, but on the contrary would often Say that they had done nothing but their duty as his fathers Subjects were bound to do.' After Culloden Charles 'neither Spoke to any of the Scots officers present, or inquired after any of the Absent, (nor at any of the preceding battles he never had inquired after any of the Wounded Officers). He . . . was so prepossess'd against the Scots, that he was Affraid they would give him up to make their peace with the Government . . . and he always believed it, Untill the fidelity of the Highlanders, Show'd him during the long time he was hid in their Country, Convinced him and every body else of the Contrary.' The letter of farewell to his followers, printed in Browne's *History of the Highlands* (vol. iii. 263), is well known. Elcho asserts that it was forged by Murray of Broughton and Sir Thomas Sheridan to appease the murmurs of faithful followers who had been unrewarded even with thanks for faithful and hazardous service. One would fain disbelieve Elcho; but there is nothing in Charles's later career to point the story as improbable.

C. SANFORD TERRY.

OFFICIAL GUIDE TO THE ABBEY-CHURCH, PALACE AND ENVIRONS OF HOLYROODHOUSE, with a Historical Sketch by the Right Hon. Sir Herbert Maxwell, Bart., F.R.S., LL.D., President of the Society of Antiquaries of Scotland. Compiled by direction of H.M. Office of Works. Pp. viii, 183. Post 8vo. Edinburgh: W. Blackwood & Sons. 1906. 6d. nett.

A GUIDE-BOOK by a writer of eminence is by no means unknown. Nevertheless it is a large step in advance when H.M. Office of Works

produces an Official Guide to a Scottish Royal Palace, written, at its direction, by the President of the Society of Scottish Antiquaries. Hitherto we have been familiar with the almost regal titles of Historiographer Royal, King's Limner, and Poet Laureate; enter now King's Antiquary. In no better hands might the office of Guide to a Scottish Royal Palace have been placed than in those of Sir Herbert Maxwell; and what may well be repeated in the case of the other Royal Residences in the country has most fitly been begun with the Abbey and Palace of Holyrood. The *Guide* gives us as many photographic and other views and illustrations of the buildings, etc., as can reasonably be expected in such a book; and adds to them two well-accredited plans—of the ground floor and first floor of the palace—the first of which distinguishes between the sixteenth and seventeenth century foundations, and both of which show the additions now removed. The plans include also the Abbey Church, the only part of the buildings previously shown in plan in a guide (in 1819).

It is neither easy nor necessary to be novel in a description of suites of rooms which have been tolerably described already; but in this, as in other respects, the author has produced a guide which is on the whole far superior to its predecessors. If it abridges somewhat of Duncan Anderson's account of the Royal Apartments, it expatiates to good purpose on the more historic rooms which are open to the tourist in ordinary. Regarding these, it may be noted in passing that in the Picture Gallery it gives a very full discussion of the famous portraits, not so very long ago recovered for Scotland, which are identified as contemporary portraits of King James III. and his Queen, and their son, presumably James IV., dating no later than 1476, and which are almost identified as the work of the painter Van der Goes. The section also dealing with Queen Mary's particular apartments has an interesting paragraph on the recess in her Audience Chamber which, in consideration of a tradition of slight credentials, and a likelihood scarcely stronger, is at present in danger of being 'restored' as a 'Queen Mary's Private Oratory.'

The visitor, however, and the Scottish visitor in particular, who views the Holyrood of to-day must be gratified at the signs, visible at almost every turn, that the Palace, at least, is at last in the hands of an official who both fully comprehends its interest, and can and will take adequate measures for its preservation.

At the present moment the account of the remains of the Abbey Church is specially interesting, but naturally an official print sets forth no schemes of restoration or destruction by either artificial or natural means.

Of the Historical Sketch, which fills the latter and larger part of the book, it might perhaps be enough to say that it comes from the facile and engaging pen of Sir Herbert Maxwell. But while asserting that in general it is excellent as a narrative of events, we cannot pretend not to observe the adverse attitude which this official publication assumes towards the reforming party with which Scotland is still in the main

identified. Is the Office sure that its history is true? Let us take one or two examples.

On the first night of Queen Mary's residence in Holyrood after her arrival by sea from France, a company from Edinburgh serenaded her under her windows. Knox is the Scots authority for the performance; he calls them 'a company of the most honest' [*i.e.* honourable] . . . with musicians, etc., and records that the Queen said she was pleased and 'willed the same to be continued some nights after.' The French Abbé Brantôme, however, was within the Palace, one of the Queen's suite, and just off the sea! He gives the only other account of the serenade. He says that the performers were 'rascals of the town,' who came to reprove (or insult?) the Queen (*lui donner l'aubade*) with their wretched instruments, and who actually went so far as to sing psalms. The singing and tuning was of the worst, and, in consequence, what repose! So the *Guide* throws the Scots account over, 'for we know from Brantôme how intolerable was the discord.' It does not seem at all certain that we should accept anything implicitly that the violently anti-Scottish Brantôme wrote in the circumstances. Founding on him, however, the *Guide* exhibits the Scottish welcome as ridiculous, although John Knox, it asserts, 'thought it very fine' (p. 117).

Again (p. 124), we are told that when Knox had begun his thunders against the proposed marriage of the Queen with the King of Spain, Mary sent for him and 'begged him with tears, if he must reprove her, to do so in private, as prescribed in the Book of Discipline.' No reply by the Reformer to this thrust is recorded: the suggestion is left that he was convicted of a gross inconsistency between his practice and precept. A moment's examination of course reveals (begging Mr. Lang's pardon) that the supposed citation from the book would not have applied to the case. But where is the authority for the Queen having ever attempted it? I think that there is none.

Again, when Mary on this same occasion found that she could not shake the Reformer's resolution to consider her marriage a thing of public concern, and himself a public man, she, the *Guide* continues, 'bade him "to pass furth of the Cabinet." He spent an hour in the anteroom,' it goes on, 'scolding the light-hearted ladies of the court because of their thoughtless lives and gay attire.' But the *Guide* gives only half the Queen's order. The other half was that Knox was to wait in that anteroom for her further commands. His not being in the anteroom of his own choice for the purpose of making a speech takes away the whole suggestion that he spoke all the time he was there; the suggestion is also inconsistent with the only account of the episode which exists—his own. And there is no authority for the statement that in whatever he said he 'scolded,' but something to the contrary.

To the ordinary tourist the interest of Holyrood which ranks next after its connection with the life of Queen Mary, is the fact that some of our kings are or were buried there. Imagine then his feelings, and conclusions, when he is told by this *Official Guide* that in 'the religious riots of 1688 the people burst open the Royal vault, "tearing open

the leaden coffins, and casting out the bones of kings and princes" (p. 174), that the Royal remains were, on that occasion, desecrated and 'thrown about' (p. 50)! And that, again, in 1768, on the fall of the church roof, 'the Royal tombs were rifled,—Captain Grose testifies to having seen the bones thrown about from hand to hand' (p. 180). These are but grizzly tales of ourselves to tell to the foreigner. Are they certainly true?

There is I think little or no evidence or testimony to support them; and there is a considerable amount of evidence to convince one that they are false.

To begin with, we have an account by Sir Robert Sibbald, the well-known antiquary, of the contents of the Royal Vault when he viewed it on its rediscovery, on 24th January, 1683,<sup>1</sup> five years before the riot of 1688.

It must be remembered at this point that the vault, from its position, was not the original Royal Vault of Holyrood, and that Drummond of Hawthornden records that the body of James V. was translated from its original tomb by James VI. We do not know if it was the original resting-place of any of the bodies found in it.

The vault, Sibbald says, 'seemed to have been opened before.' He describes the coffins within it as already lying open, and the remains of their lids as lying about in pieces. In all there were six coffins, containing the remains of two men, two women, and two children, as follows:

1. A coffin containing a 'body' which was over six feet four inches (two Scots ells and two inches) in length, black with the liquid balsam which preserved it. Sibbald and his companions apparently believed at the time that this was the body of King James V. The inscription in memory of the King, on which, at least mainly, they relied for this view, was however not attached to the coffin, but was found 'on plates of lead in several long pieces loose upon and about the coffin.' These they took out of the vault, and Sibbald copied the inscription 'from the plate befor the Bishop and noblemen in the ile of the Church.' They presumably replaced these plates on or near the coffin. Seeing that they found also a piece of a leaden crown lying at the side of the coffin, they might have been held to have had a good deal to say for their identification of the body, if Sibbald's MS. had not borne the words added by Sibbald himself at a later date: 'This seemeth to be the Lord Darnley his body.' The identity of this very long body is therefore in some doubt, although Fountainhall, who also inspected the vault, probably on hearing their report that they had found the body of King James, adduces a separate fact in support of their first conclusion, namely, the 'freschnesse of his body and the liquor about him,' which comported with the fact related by Drummond of Hawthornden, that King James Sixth, on transporting the body from its

<sup>1</sup> At pages 51-2 of the *Guide* appears a print of this account, which is apparently not taken directly from Sibbald's MS. The greater part at least of the MS. is still extant (Adv. Lib. 33-3-36).

original vault, had had it re-embalmed. (Fountainhall's *Historical Observes*, pp. 89-90: Bannatyne Club.)

2. Next to the first coffin lay a second, 'a gret coffin of lead,' containing another 'body,' 'the muscles of the thigh seemed to be entire; the body not so long as King James the Fifth.' Does this mean that the smaller body was in the more important coffin, or merely that the coffin was a misfit? Regarding it Sibbald says, 'I suspect the long coffin next the King may be the Earle of Murray Regent, the King's natural son.' Sibbald was, of course, wrong in this 'suspicion.' In the margin, however, he adds, 'or else the Lord Darnley.' Fountainhall calls the body Darnley's, but adds, 'others call this bodie Seigneur David Rizio's, the Italian musitian's.' Its identity, therefore, is entirely a matter of conjecture. Sibbald records distinctly that, 'There appeared no inscription on this coffin.' In addition to this, it need only be observed, in view of the statements of later visitors, that the body in this coffin was not the longest in the vault.

3. Next the south wall of the vault lay a shorter coffin to which, according to the printed version of Sibbald, 'seemeth to belong this inscription made out of long plates of lead in Saxon character. . . .' Here follows an inscription in memory of Queen Magdalen. This passage is no longer in the MS., which contains merely the statement that 'next the south wall, in a smaller arch lay a shorter coffin with the teeth in the skull,' to which words Sibbald at a later time has added, 'the Queen Magdalen's.' Fountainhall agrees. But the coffin was lidless, and had no inscription attached to it.

4. At the foot of the others lay a coffin with the only body of whose identification there is any overwhelmingly strong presumption. The coffin bore an inscription 'making it,' says Sibbald, 'to be the body of Dame Jean Stewart Countesse of Argyle, with the year of her death, I suppose 1585, or so. . . .' This coffin also was open, for Sibbald saw that the skull was sawn in two.

5 and 6. Two coffins, neither of which equalled a Scots ell in length, contained the bodies of children. Sibbald says no more. Fountainhall uses the words, 'the other two are some of their children,' whatever that may mean.

These, then, were the contents of the vault in 1683.<sup>1</sup> The rioters of 1688 came and went, and the next visitor to the vault, so far as I am aware, who described what he found in it, was John Loveday, in whose *Diary of a Tour in 1732* (Roxburghe Club, 1890, p. 148) we learn that 'the reforming mob broke into this vault, and used the dead as the principles of Mob Reformation taught 'em to do.' Whether he refers to the mob of 1688 or not he does not say, and he makes no attempt to justify his statement. But his account of the contents of the vault which had survived it, and which he saw in August, 1732, does not bear out the tale of the official *Guide*, which says that the bones were thrown about

<sup>1</sup> Arnot, the historian, is therefore wrong in saying, p. 254, that the vault contained in addition the bodies of other monarchs of the royal line of Scotland.

in 1688. On the contrary, he mentions 'the body of James V. some of his flesh on still' Queen Magdalen he only names, but he calls the remains, which he identifies as Darnley's, a 'skeleton.' 'I measured him,' he says, 'he is much about 7 foot high.' 'The only remains else, Loveday adds, 'are those of a son of James V. who dy'd young and of a bastard daughter.' This last is, of course, the Jean, Countess of Argyle, mentioned by Sibbald and Fountainhall. Loveday thus omits to mention one of the two children enumerated by these observers; but when he goes into details regarding other bodies, namely, those of the two men, his record proves that they were still intact in his day. It is scarcely doubtful that he measured the longest body in the vault for Darnley's.

Even Arnot, who talks about the 'fury of the mob at the revolution,' asserts only that they 'broke into the vault,' which from its subsequent history may not have been shut, and 'broke open the coffins, carried off the lids, but left the rest.' As we know, however, that the main accusation is false, because the coffins were open already, we need scarcely pause to consider the question of the theft of the strips of lead at the instance of the same accuser, who also mistakenly thought they were still lids. The value of Arnot's statement that the rioters respected the bodies rests upon another basis, namely, his own testimony as an eye-witness that the bodies were still existing in his own time.

Now we come to the episode of 1768, the falling in of the new stone roof, the ensuing incursion of the 'mob,' and the second story of bones thrown about. The testimony of Arnot contradicts this story also. He records that in 1776, seven or eight years after the fall of the roof, he had 'seen the body of James V. and some others in their leaden coffins' (p. 255).

As for the contradictory testimony of Captain Grose, where is it to be found? Grose has not hitherto been known to have been in Scotland before 1788, twenty years after the riot; and when he did come, he transcribed Arnot's account of the church wholesale into the book which he came to write (*Antiquities of Scotland*, i. 30), without a word about having been present with the rabble in 1768. All he adds is that in the year in which he writes, 1788, 'the royal bodies are no longer shewn, though the thigh bones of Lord Darnley [sic] are still remaining and exhibited by the ciceroni of the place, with some of ordinary size by way of comparison.' These bones, as well as the no less sacred specimens 'of ordinary size,' were no doubt handed about. But the bone stories of the Scottish mobs of 1688 and 1758 appear to be groundless.

There was, indeed, a real desecration of these remains, whosever they all were, which took place in no storm of revolution or reformation. Arnot shows only too plainly that it took place, at least mainly, between two visits which he paid to the vault, the one in 1776, as already mentioned, and the other shortly before 1779, the date at which he wrote his book. During that interval the leaden coffins were stolen, and the neglected remains, of which certainly most, and probably all, are spoken of as *bodies* in 1776, and some were by every reasonable supposition

Royal, began to be dispersed piecemeal. Whether the first offender was some sordid pilfering plumber, such as still strips lead off the roofs of untenanted houses, or was a venal custodier of the relics themselves, the rest of the offence was that of the essentially modern person, the curiosity hunter, the collector of historical relics. And the blame of the neglect which made these depredations possible lies against the memory of the Crown officials of the time of our own great-grandfathers.

J. H. STEVENSON.

THE REGISTER OF THE PRIVY COUNCIL OF SCOTLAND. Edited and abridged by P. Hume Brown, M.A., LL.D. Second Series. Vol. VII., A.D. 1638-1643. Pp. lxvii, 808. Roy. 8vo. Edinburgh: H.M. General Register House. 1906. 15s. nett.

In the volume preceding this (reviewed *ante* iv. p. 86) there was much evidence of the obstinate defiance with which Charles I. met the obvious opinion of his Scottish people regarding Laud's Service book and the like. The present volume shews the consequences of Charles's policy in the Glasgow Assembly of 1638, the Bishops' Wars of 1639 and 1641, the Irish Rebellion which broke out in 1641, and generally the beginnings of the civil war which was to cost the king his head. Professor Hume Brown, in his careful introduction, traces the course of events as mirrored in the records of the Privy Council. Now for the first time published in their entirety, these records shew that it was from no lack of warning from his Scottish advisers that Charles made his fate inevitable. Yet the book is infinitely more interesting in its domestic than in its political record. The editor shrewdly remarks that in spite of the conflict in Church and State, there is little indication of any serious interruption to the routine of the national life. There was feudal and tribal violence, but it was not anarchy. Scotland was leaving behind it the practices of the sixteenth century, although there was still too much record of 'bangsterie and oppresioun' (p. 309), of men lying 'at await in the hieway boddin with sword stalfe and gwnne' (p. 311), and of border 'thifts stouthreaffes and other nefarious facts' committed by reivers with picturesque nicknames such as 'Jock Elliot called Jock a gods name,' 'Johne Croser called the Fryday theefe,' or 'Thomas Johnston called the Cleg' (pp. 352-3). Alongside of such uncivilized proceedings as ended in 'bauch and blaue straikes' (p. 342), there are fiscal expedients such as monopolies in tobacco pipes (p. 325) and improvements in poststages between Portpatrick and Carlisle (p. 327).

Everywhere one sees that quaintness of phrase did not expire with the sixteenth century. When Colin Campbell, meeting Robert Inglis in Glasgow, called Robert a rascal and 'douped' him on the breast, he added further insult to injury by bidding him quit the street 'or he sould get his harnes doung out' (p. 447). This, however, was mildness itself compared with the 'barbarous and evil' convocation of rebellious Macdonalds marching 'neir the ports of Innernes with blowin pypes, bowes, gunnes and other offensive wapons' (p. 576),—an entertaining, if

ambiguous classification of the bagpipe among lethal instruments. It is grievous to see so much depredation, turbulence, slaughter, and mutilation by armed bands. Many curious episodes occur, such as the quarrel between retainers of Lord Banff and the Earl of Findlater. Banff's servant wilfully shot the earl's falcon near Cullen, and when the falconer complained to Lord Banff he was told, 'Goe home and take your dead hawke to be Yuill meat to your lord and ladie and tell your maister that he is not crownter now of the shyre' (p. 414).

Demonology and witchcraft come into view occasionally. The General Assembly in 1643 declared it to be 'a time wherein the devill before he be dispossessed is in a rage by tearing nations with civill warres' (p. 380). One extremely interesting witchcraft trial appears in 1640 when Katherine Craigie was charged with sorcery and divination relative to Robert Robson's sickness. The problem was 'whether it be a hill spirit a kirk spirit or a water spirit that troubles him.' The witch's answer was obtained by putting three stones in the fire, then laying them under the doorstep, and finally dropping them into a vessel of water. What she said to the man's wife, as the solution, was—'Jonat, it is a kirk spirit which troubleth Robbie your husband.' Her prescription for his cure was that the wife should accompany her 'about the crosse kirk of Wosbuster and the loche of Wosbuster before sunrysing.' For this last, on her own confession, Katherine was condemned, and the execution of her sentence remitted to the dempster. A 'trowie glove' used to break a boil, a charm by casting water amongst bear-seed to get a good crop, and 'a grasse' as a love charm are other folk-lore features of this singular case which was tried in the church of St. Magnus at Kirkwall. Choice specimens of abusive language occur (p. 540), and a female thief is referred to (p. 626) as 'called Robertsoun utherwayes the Hiland cow.'

The adoption in Scotland of 1st January as the beginning of the year is contrasted with the older practice then still in force in England, for letters from the court in England in January, February and March, 1642, bear, added after the year, the words 'stilo Scotico.' (The January commencement for the civil, ecclesiastical, and legal year in England did not come into statutory force until 1753.) Impressive ceremonial degradation of notaries for forgery (pp. 38, 55) shews a survival of forms of ecclesiastical penance. Very stirring is the tale from Kirkcaldy in 1643 when one night a notary there and his son assaulted to the effusion of blood an advocate who had acted for the burgh. Next morning the notary 'vaunted thereof saying "Thir twa hands hes givin the town of Kirkdaleis advocat for his pains a dosoun of nevvells [i.e. blows with the fist] and if they wer not weill layed on devill cutt aff my hands"' This was most reprehensible. 'Quhilk,' said the outraged advocate in his petition to the Council, 'is a proud contempt and may prove of dangerous consequence to all advocats if the same be not exemplarlie punished.' References to the removal of march-stones, to kidnapping, to the tribulations of certain indwellers in Ayr who are 'prisonners with the mercilesse Turkes,' to the cudgel play and peat throwing of discontented parishioners at the kirk of Stoneykirk, and to the union of

## Register of the Privy Council of Scotland 463

serving men in a 'societie and brotherhood' addicted to drinking and excess, all combine to illustrate the vigour of the time and the raciness of records. Professor Hume Brown's ample index and lucid introduction are a very satisfactory equipment for a volume which reveals aspects of Scottish life so vivid and so various that they may well surprise readers expectant chiefly of political and ecclesiastical preoccupations.

GEO. NEILSON.

THE ENGLISH FACTORIES IN INDIA, 1618-1621. A Calendar of Documents in the India Office, British Museum and Public Record Office. By William Foster. Pp. xlvi, 379. Med. 8vo. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1906. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS volume continues the tale of one aspect of English commerce with India which has already been made accessible up to 1617 in *Letters received by the East India Company from its Servants in the East*. It is to be hoped that no prospective reader will be deterred by the use of the word 'Calendar' in the sub-title. Necessarily a certain amount of compression has been unavoidable in dealing with a mass of documents, many of which are of great length, but the method adopted secures the inclusion, word for word, of all the portions of the letters that are likely to be of general interest. Thus the printed book will serve the purpose of all students, except perhaps a few who may investigate some highly specialised lines of inquiry. As might be expected, Mr. Foster has again proved himself a very able editor. Both wide knowledge and an insight into the conditions of life in India at the period have been required for the production of the scholarly introduction and the foot-notes. While the latter are most unassuming, the majority of them, which identify the names of persons or things, disguised under the haphazard orthography of the factors, must have involved great research, and in several cases the lengthy solution of an intricate puzzle is reduced to half a line of print, or even to a few words.

The records, so carefully edited, are fully worthy of the care spent upon them. They cover the interesting period marked on the one side by the decline of Portuguese ascendancy in the East, and on the other by the rise of that of the Dutch. The struggles of the servants of the company against European rivals, as well as with the natives, are told at first hand by the actors in the drama, often in picturesque and forcible language. Moreover, this volume includes many accounts of sea-fights, and is thus a valuable commentary on *Purchas*, not only as containing additional details, but also in tracing the antecedent and subsequent events.

Obviously it would be impossible to do justice to a book of this kind by quotation, and the following are to be taken as only a few specimens of the human nature of some of the writers of these letters. For instance, it is recorded (p. 15, cf. p. 23) that the Dutch had established a factory, and 'they come in upon the same ground that wee began, and by which wee subsist, feare.' As a consequence of this policy it is not surprising that Sir Thomas Roe gives instructions 'to compel the inhabitants to trade . . .

which will force them to understand the interest of free commerce' (p. 20). A surgeon was sent from Surat to Broach with the following letter of advice: 'Wee pray you further to have an especially care [to] keepe him sober, that wee be not through him genera[llly] scandalised by these infidells; which, except you looke [very] narrowly to him (if any stronge drinke be stirrингe), you will hardly performe' (p. 99). There are many complaints of the prejudice of the company through the pilfering of the seamen and the private trade carried on by the officials. It was said, if men were good for nothing at home, 'send them to the East Indies.' William Methwold writes that the sailors had 'stolne without proportion, sould without consideration and spent without discretion; and in all these behaved themselves so like barbarous outlaws that I feare our nation, formerly well reputed of, will suffer a perpetuall scandall for their most intollerable misdemeanours.' As regards private trade, 'that which was so accompted formerly is now publick' (p. 153). Matthew Duke, an accountant, comments in the following terms on the difficulties he experienced in the reducing of the various currencies. Such reduction 'breeds intollerable fractions not fitting merchants accounts, for ther is more troble to reduce the fraction then about all the rest of thaccount . . . When these thing[s] shall com to the generall booke-keeper to enter what a labarinth it will bring him into . . . Although I know well enough how to reduce a fraction to his least denomenacion yet to be much troubled with them is tedeou[s]' (p. 264). Members of the factories protested vigorously against the action of the superiors or inferiors, as the case might be. As an instance of the former, there is the comment of Robert Jeffries, who was dismissed from Persia by the 'trynal trechery' of 'our critical agent,' 'our carnall minister,' 'our infernal pheision': 'the world, the flesh and the divell' (p. 241); and of the latter, the regret for the vexations caused by 'that serpent & dogg, Isack Beaze,' which gave 'little hoope of better usage amongst these pernicious helhounds' (p. 344). There is a ring of 'the spacious days' of the previous century in the following extract from the account of an engagement at sea: 'the day following (being Sonday), about nyne in the morning both fleets encountered under saile, and the third bord our fleet made (being bountifull with bullets) recovered the wynde from the enemye; and so yt pleased God they found such entertainment that forced them to their anchors, giving them continewall battery; and, thinking to remove them fiered the prize, which (as God would) did not second our desiers with successe. So in the night beaten over and over, they departed with dishonour . . . God graunt them lyke successe whenever they pretende lyke disturbance to our quiet trade. And to Almyhtye God be the glorie for this happie victorie' (p. 242).

W. R. SCOTT.

THE CAMPAIGN OF PLATAEA. By H. B. Wright, Ph.D. Pp. 148.  
New Haven, U.S.A. 1904.

DR. WRIGHT has made a patient and thorough study of all the material from which light can be derived for the explanation of the much-discussed

campaign of 479 B.C. He applies a critical microscope to the ancient monuments and to the literary tradition from Herodotus to Photius and the Scholiasts, and carefully weighs the views of modern students. Among the conclusions at which he arrives the following are perhaps the most striking. Accepting Eduard Meyer's theory of a revision of the text of Herodotus in Periclean time, he holds it probable that the narrative did not receive its final form till after the capture of the Spartans at Pylos, thinking that the strictures on Spartan courage in Herodotus could not have found acceptance earlier. He maintains that to this revision, which does not necessarily involve bad faith on the part of Herodotus, are due all the passages in which Greek states hostile to Athens during the Peloponnesian War are belittled, and that the striking passage (ix. 64) in which Pausanias is complimented really represents the tradition as current in the age of Cimon. All the evidence, apart from the 'Periclean' passages and the tradition based upon them, tends to show that the success of the campaign was due to the skill and foresight of Pausanias and the admirable conduct of his troops. In general the book is a vindication of Pausanias, the Spartans, and the Greek allies.

By a curious slip, in discussing the shifting of the wings before the battle, Dr. Wright urges that the Spartans had as much experience of Persian fighting as the Athenians, since they had recently faced the Persians at Thermopylae. It would be pertinent to ask how many of the Spartans at Plataea could have had this advantage. But Dr. Wright does not generally push his conclusions further than his premisses warrant, and to most of them we can assent with little hesitation. He displays acuteness and sound judgment in addition to his learning, and his work is one which no student of Greek military history can afford to ignore.

GILBERT A. DAVIES.

**GARIBALDI'S DEFENCE OF THE ROMAN REPUBLIC.** By George Macaulay Trevelyan. Pp. xv, 377. Demy 8vo. With maps and other illustrations. London: Longmans, Green & Co. 1907. 6s. 6d. net.

IT is the habit of the foreigner touring in Italy to spend the hot hours of the afternoon in the *pinacoteca* of the provincial town at which he has halted. The *custode* is sleeping in his chair, and the traveller is left to wander through the empty sun-lit rooms, tracing along the walls the rise and decline of Italian art. Before retracing his steps at the end of the labyrinth of saloons he will probably find, in some small side room, a collection of relics of the *Risorgimento*—tattered tunics, tarnished sabres, and torn orders and despatches, whose ink is slowly fading in the sunlight. He is probably satisfied with a cursory glance round the cases, for his knowledge of Italian history does not carry him beyond the Renaissance, and the enthusiasms of the mid-nineteenth century, in the light of the last fifty years, appear vain and ill-founded to one tinged with the imperialism of our day.

To historical students, further, the side of the Italian struggle represented by these memorials is of minor importance. They view the independence and unification of Italy as one phase of an international conflict which was waged by diplomacy and war through years during which the Italians as fighters contributed nothing to the forces arrayed on either side. The centres of the struggle were Paris, Berlin, and Vienna, and the contribution of Italy was the diplomatic genius of Cavour. No one of the Italian patriots has suffered more from the wider and deeper reading of events which the lapse of years has produced than Garibaldi. He is, of course, enshrined in the hearts of his countrymen as the national hero *par excellence*—every Italian town proves it by its streets, where one finds the Corso or Piazza Garibaldi, which puts in the shade the Via Cavour, and the side street named after Mazzini. But to the political student he stands for nothing; to his loud enthusiastic shout of 'Italy! Liberty!' the critic replies, 'Certainly. An excellent sentiment. But what did you mean by liberty as applied to the Italy of your day? Cavour represented the House of Savoy, and Mazzini Republicanism, and you fought for both. You were merely a blind force—a first-rate leader of irregular troops, not a great general. Your most brilliant achievements were either in vain, or where they produced positive results, merely hastened the inevitable by a few months. You often hindered the well-devised schemes of Cavour, and roused the hostility of the friendly powers whose policy was directed to a far more stable solution of the Italian question than a simple prejudiced ignorant fighter like you could grasp. You certainly did a great work in reviving Italian patriotism in the south, but Mazzini was before you, as you generously acknowledged, and the Crimean war did more to unite the body of the nation in its own eyes, and in the eyes of Europe, than all your gallant feats of arms. You must not be deceived by the tributes which are still being paid to you in stone and bronze in Italy. You are the only figure which appeals to all the nation. No party has made you its own. Mazzini is the divinity of the Republicans, and his celebration is a political demonstration which the government regards with unfriendly eyes. The greatness of Cavour is not of the simple kind which appeals to the crowd. You remained throughout your life so simple and elemental and impulsive, that in you Italy pays homage to all the nameless gallant boys who died for her.'

It is doubtful whether Mr. Trevelyan would accept this attitude as the correct one on the part of readers of his brilliant monograph on *Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic*, but the book, with all its merits, can only be accepted as a serious contribution to history if it is taken as an enthusiastic defence of Garibaldi's conduct in 1849 from the point of view of a partizan of his own time. Readers of to-day cannot accept the mid-Victorian view of Garibaldi's achievements which is reflected in Mr. Trevelyan's pages. As a dramatic reconstruction of the siege and the retreat it could hardly be surpassed, and no one, even in Italy, is probably competent to criticise the author's detailed account of the hand-to-hand struggle on the walls of Rome, gathered from a careful

examination of contemporary documents and oral tradition, but the book cannot be accepted as a balanced account of the events described, even from the point of view of a military historian. Mr. Trevelyan, for example, passes a severe judgment on General Oudinot's alleged bad faith at the time of the termination of the truce at the beginning of June, but he does not give his readers both sides of the case. He does not mention the strained relations and the repeated ruptures between the leader of the French forces and De Lesseps; and his account of the mission of the latter, and of the negotiations with Mazzini, is inadequate. Whatever censure Oudinot may merit should probably be transferred to the French Government, which kept him in the dark as to the meaning of De Lesseps' mission, perplexed him with conflicting instructions, encouraged him in his opposition to the negotiations with Mazzini, and finally directed him back to his original orders, which authorised him to treat the defenders of Rome as the unwelcome guests of a friendly populace, and as opponents outside the ordinary laws of warfare. It must further be remembered, before passing a judgment on Oudinot, that he always underestimated the defensive powers of the Republic from the time of his first failure before the walls of Rome up to the commencement of the final struggle. His instructions were to avoid fighting, if possible, and he probably expected that by seizing, on the morning of June 3rd, a commanding position which overlooked the Republican lines he would have gained his end without bloodshed. Mr. Trevelyan's judgment on this important matter is too sweeping, and would probably be modified by an unbiased re-examination of French sources and of additional material furnished in the authoritative work of MM. Bourgeois and Clermont, '*Rome et Napoleon III.*', published in March of this year, in which are printed for the first time a number of important papers from the *Archives de la guerre et des affaires étrangères*, not to be found in De Lesseps' *Ma Mission à Rome*.

This example must suffice to indicate the limitations of Mr. Trevelyan's work. Such limitations may have been self-imposed by the author, but they none the less detract greatly from its value. The negotiations between the Triumvirate and De Lesseps are inextricably bound up with the military side of the defence of Rome and the long cessations of hostilities which punctuated the siege, and even the engagements themselves, were so dependent on diplomatic considerations, that the actual fighting cannot be presented in abstracted form without a confusion of values and perspective. When Mr. Trevelyan deals incidentally with the wider issues involved in the course of events which he describes he presents again such a limited view, and his judgments are so biased, that one is tempted to the conclusion that he has yielded himself to his strong dramatic sense, and writes history incarnate in the person of a comrade of Garibaldi. One cannot, for instance, accept his wholesale condemnation of the French expedition to Rome. The ephemeral Republic of Mazzini was doomed from the beginning, and the only question was which power was to restore the temporal sovereignty of the Pope. The French proposed to do so on conditions, the maintenance of which they would have been pledged

## 468 Garibaldi's Defence of the Roman Republic

in honour to secure, had the Republic accepted their intervention and withdrawn from a hopeless struggle. The alternative to the French intervention, based on the claim which France made to be a power representing both national liberties and Roman Catholicism, was intervention by Spain, Austria, and Naples, which would have meant restoration of the Pope without guarantees of any kind. The French Government was, of course, in an impossible position ; if it abandoned the Pope it lost the support of the majority of its electors ; if it abandoned the liberties of the people of Rome, it lost prestige abroad as the champion of oppressed peoples, and the suffrages of the liberals at home. In these circumstances, French intervention was inevitable, and it was in the highest interests of Italy that it should have been accepted on the best terms which the Republic could obtain. Had Mazzini and his fellow Republicans withdrawn, the French troops would have followed them within two years, and Rome would have become the capital of Italy years before that event actually took place. It was in the logic of events that Rome should crown the work of Italian unity, and Mr. Trevelyan's plea that the bloodshed of 1849 sanctified it for that end in the eyes of the nation must give way to the fact that the struggle of Mazzini and Garibaldi delayed the completion of the work.

While the historical value of Mr. Trevelyan's volume is affected by his bias, which reduces it to the category of *mémoires pour servir*, its very limitations heighten its romantic appeal. For the defence of Rome and the retreat over the Apennines were, after all, a fourteenth century feat of arms performed out of due time. English readers have to thank the author for this eloquent and picturesque volume, which will take its place among the books without which no intelligent traveller can visit Rome.

DAVID BAIRD SMITH.

DIE METZER CHRONIK DES JAIQUE DEX (JACQUES D'ESCH) ÜBER DIE  
KAISER UND KÖNIGE AUS DEM LUXEMBURGER HAUSE. Heraus-  
gegeben von Dr. Georg Wolfram. Pp. xcv, 534. 4to. Metz :  
Verlag von G. Scriba, 1906.

ALTHOUGH edited in German, the text of this fine chronicle of the House of Luxembourg from the Emperor Henry VII. (1308-13) till near the close of the reign of the Emperor Sigismund in 1437 is in old French throughout, in a dialect of the district of Metz. A composite work, its contents when analysed indicate that the compiler, setting himself to the task of chronicling the fortunes of the emperors from the beginning of the fourteenth century, found ready to his hand, and therefore proceeded to incorporate, complete, in his work, first the *Voeuz de l'Epervier*, a metrical record of Henry VII.'s expedition to Rome in 1311-13; second, the *Guerre de Metz*, a long poem (297 stanzas of seven lines each) minutely describing the war of 1324-5, which King John of Bohemia made on the townsmen of Metz; and third, a number of short pieces in Latin and French on the latter subject. These

## Die Metzer Chronik des Jaique Dex 469

incorporated parts of the chronicle are contemporary with the events described, and are of primary historical account. The compiler's own prose narrative, which begins with an abstract of the reign of Henry VII., becomes of great and independent consequence from 1346 onwards, its account of the battle of Crecy containing an interesting variant of the story of the death of the blind King John of Bohemia. From about 1399 the chronicle assumes more directly a contemporary tone and records many current facts, especially of war and the court of Luxembourg, making frequent allusions in the third person to things done and said by Jaique Dex, otherwise Jacques d'Esch. The intimacy of these allusions and the interest taken by the writer of the chronicle in the family to which Jaique Dex belonged, have led to what seems a well warranted conclusion, that this knight, a representative of a prominent Metz family, was himself the author. He was born in 1371, rode in 1399-1400 in the Prussian crusade (of which he gives a circumstantial account), was sent ambassador to the Emperor Sigismund in 1433, and was still active in a military capacity at Metz when the chronicle in 1434 is near its close. He evidently occupied a foremost place in personal standing as well as administration in the Metz region, so that his chronicle, though sometimes loose about dates, fully justifies the editor's estimate of its great significance for general history, and its supreme importance in the annals of Metz.

An experienced soldier and diplomatist, the author, though without the graces of Froissart or the descriptive touch of Jehan le Bel, was a close observer and a shrewd critic. *Querrez enz cronicques dez Dex*, a note by a sixteenth-century scribe of a Metz MS., is the one direct but conclusive external testimony to Dex as author. For military facts, of course, the story of such a writer has a practical value far beyond that of the normal clerical annalist. Jaique Dex ranks with Jehan le Bel and Sir Thomas Gray as a capable and interesting narrator of public movements, and especially of the incidents of warfare in which he himself had his direct part or indirect connection. Jaique Dex probably was not personally engaged in the campaign of Sigismund which ended in the terrible disaster to the Christian arms at Nicopolis on 28th September, 1396, the day on which the Highland clans fought their historic duel on the Inch of Perth. Wyntoun, at the close of his account of that bloody duel, says :

‘In the selff houre of that day,  
In Ungary as I herd say,  
Off Saraceny and off Cristyn men  
Done wes the grete battaile then,  
Ouhare mony Nobillis off Fraunce  
Tuk in the feld thare last chance,  
Ouhare mony first ware tane and slane,  
And syn til dede put wyth gret Payne.’

Wyntoun's Metz contemporary knew all about this great battle, though he chose only to name a few of the slain and captive ‘Messins,’ and others

‘de nos marches,’ who were in the army which Bajazet overthrew. He describes the savage massacre which that Tartar chief made of his prisoners, and he returns with obvious satisfaction to record in two pages of digression the fate, a few years later, of Bajazet at the hands of Tamerlane. As historian of the reign of the unlucky Emperor Sigismund, this chronicler found many things of moment to say concerning the Council of Constance and the burning of John Huss and Jerome of Prague—‘ii notables clercs qui s'appelloient House et Gerome que par leur predicacions firent eslever le pueple contre lez noblez et contre l'esglise et ostre le leur et butiner et deschassier tuis ceulx qui ne voulloient estre de leur obeisance.’ The army ordinances of 1431 for the campaign directed against the Hussites are incorporated, as also is a ceremonial description of the coronation of the emperor by the pope in 1433. Metz being the capital of Luxembourg, and a fortified frontier town of high importance, its affairs were of much more than provincial consequence to the imperial line of the Luxembourg dynasty. Metz was a free imperial city, ‘the chamber and shield of the empire against the marches of the realm of France,’ and thus, as it were from its watch-tower, the outlook of Jaique Dex was not so much provincial as imperial. In this fact lies its European breadth of interest and value.

It is an admirable chronicle, emancipated from the medieval creed of portent and miracle, and with unusual touches, such as the mention of the Emperor Sigismund’s emotion when he spoke with the ambassadors of Metz in 1433—‘he had the tear in his eye.’ Odd bits of gossip occur, such as the statement that the Hussites worshipped a goose on the altar. The reason assigned being philological, we need not be surprised to find its foundations shaky. ‘Car le nom dudit Housz s’appelle une oie en nostre langue et pour lui honnorer honnoroint ilz une oie.’ Curious examples of feudal defiance appear: visitations of the plague are alluded to; bills of fare of 1377 are piquant, the emperor entertaining the king of France to a ‘gross’ dinner after the German manner, while the return dinner given by King Charles ‘estoit trop pluz coustanteable.’

The *Voeuz de l’Epervier* has a double interest. As a historical *chanson de geste* of high veracity it deals poetically with the imperial coronation of Henry VII., and in precise conformity with other contemporary records in prose describes the death of Thiebault of Bar, Bishop of Liège, in 1312, and that of the emperor himself the following year. As literature it has a unique connection with the better known *Voeux du Paon*, written, it is believed, in 1313 in consequence of a ‘command’ to the author, Jacques de Longuion, by this very Thiebault of Bar. So says Jacques de Longuion himself:

‘Qui au command Tybaut, qui de Bar fut nays,  
Rimoia ceste ystoire qui est bele a devis.  
Tybaut fu mors à Romme avec I Lembourgis  
Qui empereres est si ot a non Henris.’

Besides the use of the machinery of vows on the sparrowhawk absolutely analogous to the use made of the peacock in the *Voeux du Paon* there

## Die Metzer Chronik des Jaique Dex 471

is a direct allusion to the story of that poem in the words ascribed to the gallant Bishop of Liège :

'Joys ja pairler que Porrus si tuait  
Ung parvonce ansi que a lorrier trouvait  
Li chevaliers de giete chescun diaulz envoiait.'

The 'vows of the sparrowhawk,' however, made by the court at Milan were for performance of feats which were in some few of the cases facts of history. They were vows to do things of a minute and intimate kind, which actually did occur in the course of Henry VII.'s Italian campaign, some of them at the siege of Brescia. So in this poem, written probably between 1314 and 1320, there was applied to the historical expedition of Henry VII. a mechanism of vows which in our British literature was to be poetically applied to a mythical journey Romeward of King Arthur. The vows in the alliterative *Morte Arthur* thus had a quasi-historical precedent in the very curious story of the vows of the sparrowhawk told of the year 1311.

The *Guerre de Metz* (which was first published by E. de Bouteiller in 1875) is a purely historical poem, written 'pour eschevoir mirancolie,' to tell the story of the so-called 'war of the four kings who set siege to the good city of Metz.' Commenced in a fine spirit of patriotism which made the author declare that Metz surpassed all other cities even as the rose excels all other flowers, it told circumstantially how the Messins successfully withstood the forces of King John of Bohemia and his three allies in 1324-1325. The French editor in 1875 recalled with many a pang the past glory of Metz. 'Ne trouvant qu'un tombeau je le couvre de fleurs,' said Leon Gautier in a sadly felicitous quotation of contemporary verse. Dr. Wolfram, who utilizes much of the glossarial annotation of the original edition, wisely leaves it to his readers to draw their own reflections on the historic fortunes of Metz.

Medieval Metz occupied front rank among the republican cities of the empire. Dr. Wolfram has great credit by his presentment of a chronicle in which the imperial features are as recognizable as in the city itself. It is an acquisition to the history of Europe, and its author, identified by Dr. Wolfram, becomes a new and vigorous personality among the chroniclers of the closing middle age.

GEO. NEILSON.

**WOMAN : HER POSITION AND INFLUENCE IN ANCIENT GREECE AND ROME, AND AMONG THE EARLY CHRISTIANS.** By James Donaldson, M.A., LL.D. Pp. 278. Crown 8vo. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1907. 5s. nett.

PRINCIPAL DONALDSON has been well advised in collecting and republishing his papers on this subject, that appeared twenty or thirty years ago in the *Contemporary Review*, and he here supplements these by further discussion. Special note deserves to be taken of the elaborate bibliography of the subject which is here presented, extending to over

a dozen closely printed pages. Worthy of a place, perhaps, in this important collection of authorities, is the first volume of Mr. Holmes's recently-published *Life of Justinian*, where the position of women in ancient times is discussed at considerable length in connexion with the union formed between the Emperor and Theodora. As it lies before us, the volume presents a connected and fairly complete account of the subject discussed, while those who are more particularly interested in it have abundant means suggested of prosecuting a more exhaustive study. Probably in Republican Rome things were not in quite so bad a state, in actual practice, as that suggested by the Roman Catholic writer, Mdlle. Bader, who has lauded the virtue of the Romans because no divorces took place at Rome before the middle of the third century B.C. 'The Roman husbands,' she says, 'did not divorce their wives, they killed them.' No doubt the law allowed them to do so; but, as Mill reminds us, 'the laws of most countries are far worse than the people who execute them, and many of them are only able to remain laws by being seldom or never carried into effect. If married life were all that it might be expected to be, looking to the laws alone, society would be a hell upon earth.' This is fully as true of Roman society as of the British society to which Mill applied it, and it seems a clear case in which the literature of a nation is a better index than its laws to national happiness and morality. For, as Dr. Donaldson points out, 'examining history, I think we must come to the conclusion that the Roman ideas of marriage had not a bad effect on the happiness or morals of the women.' In connexion with the question of re-marriage, mention is made of a Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland who had seven wives. This was the Rev. David Williamson, who died 6th August, 1706. 'After three score he married the seventh wife.' It is possible to underestimate, as well as to overestimate the influence of Christianity in the emancipation of women. Its influence doubtless will be regarded as very considerable by those who, with Prof. Bury, allow, as one of the five contributory causes—far more satisfactory than those of Gibbon—to the spread of Christianity, 'the attraction which it possessed for women, who felt themselves placed upon a spiritual equality with men.'

JOHN HUTCHISON.

THE IRISH PARLIAMENT, 1775. From an Official and Contemporary Manuscript. Edited by William Hunt, M.A., D.Litt., President of the Royal Historical Society. Pp. xxxiv, 91. Demy 8vo. London : Longmans, Green & Co. 1907. 3s. 6d. nett.

FOR reasons which need not be given at length here, the manuscript presented by Dr. Hunt does not add as much as might be expected of a book with such a title to our knowledge of the minutiae of Irish Parliamentary history. Within its limits the introduction is useful and instructive, but the value of the text would have been greatly enhanced by annotation, and this is not supplied. Many of the names included in the list offer matter for interesting comment; and a comparison of Sir

## Hunt: The Irish Parliament, 1775 473

John Blaquiere's list with 'Falkland's' *Review of the Irish House of Commons* (1789), and with M'Dougall's *Sketches of Irish Political Characters* (1799), would have supplied an editor so skilful as Dr. Hunt with much suggestive material. The volumes mentioned differ from the list printed by Dr. Hunt in having been prepared for the public eye, whereas Sir John Blaquiere's was strictly confidential and meant only for official eyes. But they too are in the nature of scandalous chronicles; and, despite their later date, contain notices of not a few of the members whose record was a matter of so much importance to Lord Harcourt's Irish administration.

C. LITTON FALKINER.

**SKETCH OF SAINT BERNARD'S.** Compiled by John Turnbull Smith, LL.D. Pp. 152. 4to. Edinburgh: Banks & Company. 1907.

How a district in the northern parts of Edinburgh came to be known as 'St. Bernard's' has never been satisfactorily explained. That there is a 'St. Bernard's cave' near the southern end of the district, in the rocky side of the ravine of the water of Leith, Dr. Turnbull Smith here reminds us. And that a little further north, on the river bank, there is a 'St. Bernard's well,' a sulphur spring still performing the office of a modest Spa, is well known. The cave, now irrevocably built up by the retaining wall under the back-greens of the north side of Randolph Crescent, and the well, now sheltered and petted within Grecian pillars, both figure in a somewhat doubtful tradition rehearsed by Dr. Smith—that the great Abbot of Clairvaux resided for a time in the cave and first recognised the quality of the water.

The major portion of the *Sketch*, with which Dr. Smith presents us, is concerned strictly with the district, church, and parish now called after the saint. For the earlier history of the district the author announces that he is indebted mainly to Mr. Cumberland Hill's *Historic Memorials and Reminiscences of Stockbridge, Dean, and Water of Leith*, but for later things, from 1822 till the time of writing, he depends on the parochial church records, miscellaneous authorities, and his own memories.

Although modestly set forth, and primarily addressed to the people of a single parish church, this latter portion of the book contains matters of interest to the general student of social and religious questions, as well as some material for the enquirer into biography and genealogy. To the libraries of its immediate audience the book will be a most gratifying addition. It is pleasantly written, handsomely printed, and embellished with reproductions of some interesting prints and portraits, among other illustrations.

J. H. STEVENSON.

**THE BOOK OF ALMANACS.** Compiled by Augustus de Morgan. Third edition. Revised by E. J. Worman, M.A. Pp. xxiv, 90. Oblong 8vo. Cambridge: Macmillan & Bowes. 1907. 5s. net.

WHOMEVER has frequent occasion to verify historical dates may well cherish lasting gratitude to the memory of the mathematician, Augustus de

## 474 De Morgan : The Book of Almanacs

Morgan, for the labour he spent in framing these tables showing the almanac for every year—old style or new—from any epoch up to A.D. 2000. In general works of chronology it is often necessary to consult three or four different tables in order to work out a date: by De Morgan's collection of all the possible almanacs, and careful calculation of the years in which they are operative, the task of determining the day of the week and month is much shortened and reduced to the simplest proportions. An index shows opposite the year required the number of the almanac which applies. This service, a very great one, is well and lucidly accomplished. Much more complicated and much harder to work out are the formulae for finding not merely the calendar new and full moon of any year, but also the real new and full moon. After trying De Morgan's method, with its thirteen points to be particularly remembered, we have come to the conclusion that it is much easier, as well as much safer, to consult an astronomer, when determining, for instance, the moonlight available in a border raid, or on the night of Otterburn. The almanacs are compendious, showing first the ancient Roman day of the month, then the modern numeral, then the day of the week, and lastly the saint of the day. This concise manual is a valuable aid in historical study.

GEO. NEILSON.

**SAINT GEORGE.** By E. O. Gordon. Pp. 142. Royal 8vo. London : Swan Sonnenschein & Co. Ltd. 1907. 21s. net.

THIS book, nicely illustrated and bound in a copy of a sixteenth-century binding, is a popular account of the patron saint of England and of the national institutions with which his name is most associated. In spite of some labour, the author is not able to vouch for very much certain information regarding his hero, save that he was probably born at Lydda about 270 A.D., was a soldier under Diocletian until the persecution of the Christians, fought with the Dragon at Berytus, and was finally martyred at Nicomediae 303 A.D., and also that he is generally confused (by Gibbon, for instance, as the writer indignantly quotes) with the other St. George, the Arian Bishop of Alexandria. His connection with Britain seems to have begun under the British-born Constantine the Great, who founded a church in his honour at Lydda, which was rebuilt with great magnificence by the crusading King Richard I. We are treated at some length to accounts of the Saint's traces in the early liturgies (drawn chiefly from Dr. Wordsworth), and in the chronicles, and the second part of the book is written round his influence on the Arthurian 'Round Table' (which the author treats as historical), and the Order of the Garter which this inspired. We get much information about places of dedication, jewels, hostels, and artistic representations with which St. George was connected, and of celebrated Knights of his Order, so that this portion may interest certain readers; but in spite of all this, we know little more now of the Saint than did the Early Church, when, about 494 A.D., St. George

## Treatise on Law concerning Names 475

was included amongst those 'whose names are justly reverenced among men, but whose acts are known only to God.'

A. F. S.

A TREATISE ON THE LAW CONCERNING NAMES AND CHANGES OF NAME.  
By Arthur Charles Fox-Davies and P. W. P. Carlyon Britton.  
Pp. 118. 8vo. London : Elliot Stock. 1906. 3s. 6d.

A REVISED reprint of several articles which appeared some years ago in the *Genealogical Magazine*, this treatise throws its emphasis upon the urgent requirement, if not absolute necessity, of royal license for change of name. Preceding the full discussion of the group of questions converging upon this point is a bright sketch of the history of personal names. The authors have noted the special usage of Scotland regarding territorial names, such as the reservation of 'of' to proprietors, and the calling of lairds by their lands. They have not heard of the latter practice being extended (as it used to be more frequently a half century ago than now) to tenants of particular farms, sometimes to the confusion of incomers politely addressing their neighbour as Mr. Horseclose or Mr. Greenfield, unaware that these were labels of the holding, not of the holder. There is much brisk narrative of instances in the little book ; there are some good and some feeble anecdotes ; but the chief reason of its existence (abundantly justified as it is by its variety of facts and attractive discussion of principles) lies in its plea that despite some popular opinion, and some judicial *obiter dicta* to the contrary, the names of registry and baptism remain the only legal label a person can at law maintain, without royal license or act of parliament. The thesis, sharply and weightily argued, is 'that the assumption of a name of mere motion is an improper assumption.'

*Les derniers fidèles de Marie Stuart*, 8vo, 47 pp. ; *La Maison des Dames d'honneur de Marie Stuart*, 8vo, 31 pp. ; by Fernand Donnet, secrétaire de l'Académie royale d'Archéologie de Belgique : Antwerp, 1902. These two pamphlets are founded on researches made by M. Donnet in the Communal Archives of Antwerp. From legal documents preserved there he gives us in the first interesting details concerning those of Queen Mary's faithful servants who settled in Antwerp after her execution—Gilbert Curle, her secretary, his wife Barbara and his sister Elisabeth, and Henry Clifford, also once secretary to the Queen. In the second he furnishes us with a detailed history of the house in which Barbara Curle or Mowbray spent the last year of her life, establishing the identity of the house, a point left uncertain in the first paper. To the general reader the most interesting fact brought out by M. Donnet's labours is the faith, or at least the strong hope in a restoration of the Catholic religion in Scotland, as witnessed by the wills of Queen Mary's servants. To students the details regarding Henry Clifford, Gilbert and Barbara Curle, their sons and other refugees settled in Antwerp are of much interest, each fact being vouched for by documentary evidence.

*The Subject of All Verse*, by Philip Sidney (pp. 40, 8vo. London: Oxford University Press, 2s. net), is a short essay upon the authorship of the celebrated epitaph on Mary Sidney, Countess of Pembroke, which commences :

‘Underneath this sable hearse  
Lies the subject of all Verse,’

and which, since Peter Whalley placed it in 1756 in his edition of the works of Ben Jonson, has generally been attributed to that author. Mr. Sidney, however, holds that Ben Jonson, though he wrote odes to several of Mary Sidney's kinsfolk, ‘never appears to have been on terms of intimacy with the countess herself’; that in 1629 the epitaph appeared in the fourth edition of William Camden's *Remaines Concerning Brittaine*, without his name, and that it was much more probably written by William Browne, the poet-friend of Lady Pembroke's son. To William Browne, ‘who wrote the *Pastorals*,’ it is by John Aubrey (1626-1697) unhesitatingly ascribed, and it is found in a MS. copy of his works, dated 1650. Mr. Sidney deals with the readings of the lines, which are various, and gives us a short account of Lady Pembroke, whose influence on Elizabethan literature he thinks was greater than has been hitherto recognised.

*Orkney and Shetland Old-lore Series*, No. 2, contains *inter alia* articles on ‘An Orcadian Battle of a Hundred Years Ago,’ by J. T. Smith Leask, ‘The Authorship of Orkneyinga Saga,’ by Jón Stefánsson, and ‘A Legend of Shetland from Fljótsdaela Saga,’ by W. G. Collingwood. In the ‘Records’ portion commences ‘Orkney and Shetland Sasines,’ edited by Henry Paton, M.A.

The April number of the *English Historical Review* has a paper on ‘Motes and Norman Castles in Ireland,’ by Mr. G. H. Orpen. It supplies several new, dated, examples of motes built during the English conquest of Ireland, and thus materially buttresses the case for an Anglo-Norman origin of the mote generically in Ireland. Professor Vinogradoff's biographical sketch of Professor Maitland is not only a fine tribute to the varied brilliancy of the lost master of medieval law, but is at the same time a luminous criticism of his distinguishing principles of historical thought. In a damaging criticism of Professor Delbrück's *Geschichte der Kriegskunst*, Professor Tout lays due stress on the significance of Bannockburn in the evolution of the art of war in Europe.

The April *Antiquary* has illustrations of gold bracelets, English brasses, the coffin of Harvey (discoverer of the circulation of the blood), and heraldic bosses from the roofs of two Essex churches. Notable in the letterpress is Sir E. Brabrook's sketch of the beginnings of organised antiquarian study in England.

*The Reliquary* for April has many admirable archaeological pictures—a sculptured ‘Doom’ at Autun Cathedral, several examples of Norman

## Current Literature

477

font, tympanum and doorway, and a viking ship in iron-work on Stillingfleet church-door. Many readers will follow with pleasure Mr. Cooper's 'Story of the Tobacco Pipe,' with its numerous cuts of early types of pipe used in what James VI. and I. called a 'savage custome' and 'stinking suffumigation.'

*The American Historical Review* for April reports, with careful summaries of contributions, the meeting of the American Historical Association held at Providence during Christmas week, 1906. That congress shows American workers active and efficient on almost every side of history, medieval and modern, political and economic. A part of the story of the settlement of the American continent is discussed in Mr. E. P. Cheyney's examination of the English conditions of the settlement of Virginia. Not the least interesting point is the analogy in method between the colonisation of Virginia and that of Ireland under Elizabeth and James. Institutional matters of equal curiosity and philosophical importance are brought out in Mr. Van Tyne's study of the concept of Sovereignty in the American Revolution. This is an instructive presentation and criticism of the opinions regarding the State entertained by contemporary politicians, and embodies the conclusions derived from an effort to trace historically the ideas which men had during the Revolution as to the nature of Congress and the State Governments, and the powers of each. The jealousy of the constituent states in regard to the functions of Congress is well set forth, and Mr. Van Tyne infers that until almost the moment of the actual Confederation there was no common will demanding the creation of a national state. These views on the making of the American Constitution are of the broadest interest as an exposition of eighteenth century political psychology.

The *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* for April contains, in an examination of the life story of St. Francis, an analysis of the contents of a considerable section of the inedited Brussels MS. *Vita Beati Francisci*. Great importance is attached to this text as a mid-link among the sources of the Franciscan legend, and as removing some doubts and anomalies.

In the *Revue des Études Historiques* (Jan.-Feb.) a continuation of Girolamo Aleandro's familiar letters appears, including one of date 1522 from Calais, where he was unable to put to sea because of the French fleet in the channel. He denounces with his usual vigour the 'rustic and crass' heresy of the Lutherans.

The course of the history of prosecutions for witchcraft and sorcery in sixteenth century France is remarkably illustrated in an article in the *Revue Historique* by Monsieur Ch. Pfister on the career of Nicolas Remy and his dealings with sorcerers and their trials in Lorraine. The first part (March-April) traces this stern judge's biography and the development of his policy under which between the years 1591 and 1612 little short of 3000 sorcerers were put to death. Remy, author as well as persecutor, recorded his grim experiences in his *Démonolatrie*, published in 1592.

The second part of the article (May-June) examines the *Démonolatrie*, and draws from it a store of terrible things, not only on the lore of sorcery, but on the horrors of procedure against the poor creatures accused of its practice. The witches' sabbath, the search for the devil's mark and other modes of torture, and the sentence of death, are themes of curious exposition. The Devil in Lorraine played many parts, taking amongst other names that of Maitre Persin, from the deep-green colour affected by him frequently in his appearances. Saturdays and Wednesdays were the days of the witches' sabbaths, the demons, it is explained, being occupied elsewhere on other nights. Remy was a profound believer; if it is necessary to search out excuses for his judicial cruelties they may perhaps be best found in the extraordinary confessions or self-accusations which so many women so persistently made. Scepticism was a virtue hard to achieve in the teeth of the victims' own testimony.

The *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen* (April) gives text and annotations of three interesting letters of Coleridge in 1799, written from Germany, and descriptive of his tour there.

## Queries

OLD ACRES AND A RESURRECTION. I saw in a daily paper recently, among a list of names, what to me was an interesting novelty in nomenclature.

Speaking from recollection, the name was either 'Admiral Brown de Colston,' or 'Admiral Broun de Colstoun.' I hoped to find it again in the 'Navy List,' or in some book of reference, but I have searched in vain.

Have some of the descendants of the old Haddingtonshire stock adopted the territorial designation? If so, how does the gallant officer in question expect to be addressed by his intimates?

Also, will the fashion spread? It opens up an entrancing field for genealogical speculation.

Without going outside the bounds of East Lothian, shall we in the future find Douglasses assuming the affix of 'de Whittingham,' Hamiltons calling themselves 'de Innerwick,' and Lauders styled 'de Bass'?

G. S. C. SWINTON.

Since writing the above I have been referred to Stodart's *Browns of Fordell*, and find that the designation was assumed as long ago as 1878. But this makes me the more anxious to know whether there have been any other similar assumptions? Where the pedigree is proved there is something to be said in favour of so simple a way of showing an old descent; but, when the lands have gone, does it not imply that the assumer is the heir male?

G. S. C. S.

DEDICATION OF PENCAITLAND CHURCH. Mrs. J. Stewart Smith in *The Grange of St. Giles* (p. 314) says: 'This ancient parish church at Pencaitland dates back to 1213, and undoubtedly the oldest part of it bears the moss-grown appearance of its remote age. It is a perfect treasure-house of mossy stone relics, with the quaintest carvings and epitaphs. The church itself stands upon rising ground, embosomed in a grove of tall trees, with the river Tyne flowing at the foot of the garden.' Mrs. Smith mentions that the jougs are still to be seen at the kirk. Who was the patron-saint of the building?

The Lee,  
18 Colinton Road, Edinburgh.

J. M. MACKINLAY.

TURNBULL OF STRICKCATHROW, CO. FORFAR. I have gleaned the following notes concerning this family and would be glad of further information.

*Add. MS. 20701 Brit. Museum* (being a copy of the Matriculation Register of Lyon's office-of-arms, 1672-1721).

1672-7. John Turnbull of Strickcathrow, descended lineally of the family of Badyrule (Bedrule).

1672-7. — Turnbull of Smiddiehill, a younger brother of Strickcathrow.

1696. James Turnbull, only lawful son to Mr. Peter Turnbull, Minister at Laurence *als* Conveth Church, which Mr. Peter Turnbull was brother-german of the deceast John Turnbull of Strickcathrow, whose family was lineally descended of the family of Badyrule.

*Inquisitions (Retours) Scot. Abbrev.*

No. 5244, General.

12 Aug., 1669. John Turnbull of Strickcathrow heir of his father Peter Turnbull of Strickcathrow.

No. 549, Co. Forfar, and No. 8007, General.

30 July, 1698. John Turnbull, heir of his father, John Turnbull of Strickcathrow.

*Burke's Landed Gentry.*

1. James Guthrie of Guthrie, *m.* 1704, Margaret, dau. of John Turnbull of Strickcathrow, and had issue.
2. Alexander Erskine, Merchant in Montrose, youngest brother of David Lord Dun, *m.* 10 January, 1708, at Montrose, Jean Turnbull, and had issue.
3. Francis Erskine of Kirkbuddo, *m.* a dau. of Turnbull of Montrose, and had issue—a son, Francis, born 1726.
4. William Farquharson of Kinneris and Auchmitie, *m.* first, a dau. of Turnbull of Strickcathrow, and secondly, a dau. of Erskine of Kirkbuddo, and had issue.

ERSKINE E. WEST.

32 Crosthwaite Park, East, Kingstown, Dublin.

JEAN DE SCHELANDRE. Did this French poet ever stay in Scotland, and if so, where can I find information? His *Stuartide*, which was published in Paris in 1611, and is dedicated to James, King of Great Britain, shows a fair knowledge of the history and topography of Scotland, some of which, however, was evidently derived from books, as in several instances he quotes his sources. On the title-page he is described as 'Seigneur de Soumazennes en Verdunois.'

Two years before the above date he had published another small poetical work, also at Paris, under the title of 'Les trois premiers de Sept Tableaux de Penitence, par Daniel d'Ancheres, gentilhome Verdunois,' which was also dedicated to King James. The pseudonym is an anagram of 'Jean de Schelandre.'

Both books are in the British Museum Library.

L. L. K.

## Communications and Replies

A SCOTTISH TRIAL-BY-COMBAT CHARTER OF 1167.

While searching at the British Museum some years ago, I met with the copy of a charter or deed of King William the Lion, dated in 1167, touching the trial by combat, which appeared to me so interesting that I transcribed it. As I had not previously seen explicit declaration on such a high matter of international law, I made inquiries whether the writing was known to archivists. From what I ascertained I am induced to send it to you. The copy was presented, among other manuscripts, to the Trustees about forty years ago by Sir Walter Calverley Trevelyan of Wallington, and can now be consulted under the official description of Additional MS. 27409, f. 192.

The purport of the deed, in a word, seems to be this. King William makes it known that the dispute between Henry de Lambart and Alexander de Olifard, knight, had been composed to the satisfaction of both parties by his mediation. The duel allowed by the Marshal of England was referred by Henry II. to the King of Scotland for his adjudication, one of the combatants being a Scottish subject. In King William's presence, armed for the onset, they withdrew the offensive accusations, each to the other, and eternal friendship was pledged. It seems, on the face of it, to have been a very natural and sensible proceeding, but students of early institutional law will find beneath its apparent simplicity some elements of difficulty.

‘Willelmus, rex Scotie, universi in Christo ecclesie fidelibus, salutem. Sciant omnes ad quos litre iste pervenerint, quod anno ab incarnatione domini m.c.lxvij<sup>o</sup>, in presentia mea et venerabilium virorum clericorum et laicorum apud Stryelyn, talis facta est compositio inter Henricum de Lambart legatum ab Anglia et Alexandrum de Olifard militem, quos ad judicium finaliter per me fiend[um] Henricus, rex Anglie, totaliter referebat in causa duelii ipsis concessi per Mariscallum Anglie, propter quasdam accusationes per unum adversus alterum habitas, et fidei interpositione utrinque firmata, scilicet, quod coram me veniet uterque eorum armatus paratus ad congressum, et me suadente totam calumpniam, quam quisque habebat adversus alterum, confessim deponet et remittet ex corde, et dignitas utriusque salva erit, et jungent dextras et super Evangelia jurabunt se in eternum futuros veros amicos, salvo officio quod seorsim gerunt adversus Regem suum. Et omnia hec facta sunt in presentia mea. Hiis testibus, Ingelram Episcopo Glascuensi, Nicholao Cancellario, Richardo Capellano, David de Olifard, Willelmo Dolepen,

Thoma de Maundeville, Willelmo Latimer, Petro de Colevill, Barnardo filio Brian, Rogerio Camerario, Wydone Marescallo, Alexandro de Nevill, et multis aliis Scotis et Anglis.'

The first consideration is whether the document be trustworthy. The internal evidence, so far as I have tested it, seems incontrovertible, but the history of the copy is not so unsuspicious as one might desire. So far as I can gather, Sir Walter Trevelyan procured it from a pedigree of the family of Lambert, attested by Camden, Segar, and other heralds, in possession of Sir Charles Lambert Monck, Bart., of Belsay (*Archæologia Aeliana*, ii. 101). In the copy at the Museum there is a statement, no doubt taken from the entry on the pedigree, that to the deed was attached part of a seal in white wax, showing a figure, sword in hand, on horseback, and a few letters of the legend. Deeds transcribed on pedigrees, though attested by heralds, do not, within my experience, afford evidence of the first rank.

Passing over the singular delegation *ab Anglia* to the King of Scotland, the value of the document, as it appears to me, lies in its reference to the style of the 'Marshal of England,' and his connexion, at this early date, with trial by combat. Both are vexed questions into which I may not enter here. But I may note that it seems clear there was only one office of Marshal in England, and that its scope was co-terminous with the kingdom. The Marshal of the Household was, therefore, the Marshal of England. In the next place, was this incident a duel of law, and, if not, what was it? Whatever it was, the Marshal of England had jurisdiction. At all events, it must be acknowledged that the document supplies us with a very early, if not the earliest example of the use of the style of 'Marshal of England,' and very clear proof that the Marshal had jurisdiction over trial by personal combat, which savours of the chivalric duel of a later date.

JAMES WILSON.

Dalston Vicarage, Cumberland.

**EXCHEQUER TALLIES.** In the Exchequer of the Kings of England from the earliest times, tallies—'a primitive form of chirograph or indented writing' as Mr. Hubert Hall describes the system—were in use, and the use of them not only survived the Unions of 1603 and 1707, but actually lingered until the death of the last of the Chamberlains of the Exchequer in 1826. Madox's account of the institution in his *History of the Exchequer*, is well known, and so is that of Mr. Hall in his *Antiquities and Curiosities of the Exchequer*, but the following short description is taken from a paper on 'Exchequer Annuity Tallies' by Mr. Philip Norman in the *Archæological Journal*, vol. lix.:

'The Exchequer tallies were made of box, willow or other hard wood. The early ones varied from less than  $3\frac{1}{2}$  to 8 or 9 inches in length, but increased as time went on, till finally in some instances they extended almost, if not quite to 5 feet. In section they were roughly square, and tapered slightly towards the



11. Dysonne de Quelque de fine & melle

11. *Castell de Montgrí, vist de cara més de c...*

1. Estelle Loring Capote Cumming L

त्रिविद्या द्वारा विद्युत्प्रभा का प्रभाव देखिये

Ab illis regnauit super terram de gen. Com.

¶ Actio de complicitate

8. Ratto de Comitato de firmas com

Digitized by Google

GROUP OF ENGLISH EXCHEQUER



1 EXCHEQUER TALLIES (Front View)

Page 482



top end. On the obverse side the principal numeral of the sum which the tally represented was cut in a bold notch by the *tallator* or cutter of the tallies. On the reverse side the subsidiary numerals of the sum were cut in notches, an interval being left between each denomination: the notches representing the greatest value being at the thicker end of the stick. According to some early instructions, £1000 was to be represented by a notch of the width of a man's palm on the obverse. £100, when the highest figure, was cut alone on that side of the width of a man's thumb. £20 was to be as broad as the little finger, and £1 as deep as would contain a barley corn. Shillings and pence were cut on the reverse side when with pounds, otherwise they were placed on either side. Half value was represented by an incomplete or half notch. When the necessary notches had been cut, and the amount written on the two opposite sides, the tally was split by the deputy-chamberlain, the two pieces being called the tally and counter-tally, or the tally and foil. It may here be remarked that the splitting of the tally was done in the following way. Near one end it was cut half through. A knife was then inserted at the other end, and the tally was split down to the cross cut. The two parts of the tally were therefore unequal in length. It was the shorter portion that was held in the Exchequer.'

One great recommendation of the tally was its simplicity. The high-born or well-to-do yet often illiterate Sheriff of the Crown who came before the Baron of Exchequer with his proffer during Easter term had, as Mr. Hall explains the procedure, only to pay in his treasure (the revenues he had collected in the King's name in his Shire), and take an acknowledgment in the shape of a small piece of wood, inscribed in a figure writing intelligible at a glance to the meanest comprehension. When he returned at Michaelmas to conclude his annual account, this indestructible voucher was readily forthcoming from his wallet, to be compared, or rather matched, with its official counterpart. Mr. Hall points out the great advantage in durability of the wooden tally over the paper or parchment account, and considers this fully demonstrated by the perfect condition of such tallies as have survived, on which, as he says, every mark made by the knife stands out as clean and true as it did on the day when it was cut by the Chamberlain's Sergeant centuries ago.

The handwriting, too, remains, in many cases, surprisingly distinct, for the wood employed offered a surface little differing from vellum either in tint or in its capacity to take ink or gall unblurred, and preserve the inscription for an indefinite period. In the specimens forming the group in the accompanying illustration, all expressly dated (except one) in the 20th, 21st, and 22nd years of Edward I., the writing is still as fresh and clear as when the tallies were originally delivered to the persons concerned, chiefly sheriffs of southern shires. They appear to be made from hazel rods, the bark in several instances still adhering. The placing of the notches as well as some other details, may be taken to show that Mr. Norman's statement of the rules of practice does not include the variations of usage.

The shortest of these tallies (that to Robert de Bray) is just over 6 inches in length: the longest (that to Nicholas de Turville for the

farm of the county) is exactly 7 inches: the others are each about  $6\frac{1}{2}$  inches. The nicks or notches appear to be capable of complete interpretation. The thumb notch for £100 appears on Nos. 6, 7, and 10. The little-finger-breadth notch (measured from lip to lip) for £20, appears on Nos. 1, 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 11. Half notches, denoting £10, appear on Nos. 1 and 8, and a half notch, presumably for 10s. on No. 8 also appears. The notch for £1, the shallow cut for 1s., and the thin line for 1d., appear throughout.

Assuming that these are correct interpretations, the amount of each tally is distinct, as indicated in the bracketed computation attached to each item of the undernoted transcript:

- (1) De Ricardo filio Johannis de firma de Ayllesbyry. Buk.  
A° R. E. xx° Pasch. [Notched for £20 + £10 = £30.]
- (2) De Hominibus de Bedeford de firma sua. Bed.  
A° R. E. xx° Pasch. [Notched for £20.]
- (3) *Allocate vicecomiti.* De Ricardo Baud de Huntingdon de fine. Hunt.  
A° R. E. xx° Pasch. [Notched for £2.]
- (4) De Priorissa de Stodleye de fine pro imbladaturis et diversis assartis. Buk.  
A° R. E. xxj° Pasch. [Notched for 9s. + 4d. = 9s. 4d.]
- (5) De Roberto le Venour vicecomite de exitibus ville de Castre. Linc.  
A° R. E. xxj° Mich. [Notched for 10s.]
- (6) De Roberto le Venour Custode Civitatis Lincolnie de exitibus eiusdem Civitatis. Linc.  
A° R. E. xxj° Mich. [Notched for £100 + £20 = £120.]
- (7) De Radulpho de Montioye vicecomite de debitibus pluribus. Lancastr.  
A° R. E. xxj° Mich. [Notched for £100 + 13s. + 4d. = £100 13s. 4d.]
- (8) De Willelmo Tureville nuper vicecomite de remanente compoti sui. Bed. Buk.  
A° R. E. xxj° Mich. [Notched for £20 + £10 + £4 + 10s. + 5s. = £34 15s.]
- (9) De Nicholao de Turvile vicecomite de remanente compoti sui. Bed. Buk.  
A° R. E. xxj° Pasch. [Notched for £60 + £4 + 1s. + 10d. = £64 1s. 10d.]
- (10) De Nicholao de Turvile vicecomite de firma Comitatus. Bed. Buk.  
A° R. E. xxij° Pasch. [Notched for £100 + £40 + £6 + 9s. + 8d. = £146 9s. 8d.]
- (11) De Radulpho de Montioye vicecomite de debitibus pluribus de Itinere H. de Cressingham. Lanc.  
A° R. E. xxij° Pasch. [Notched for £80 + £2 + 9s. + 2d. = £82 9s. 2d.]
- (12) De Roberto de Bray pro transgressione [Notched for 6s. + 8d. = 6s. 8d.]

The date of the last tally is not expressed on its face, and the handwriting is quite different from that of the others, which all bear dates between 1291 and 1294, viz.: 20th, 21st, and 22nd years of Edward I.

The fine of Richard Baud was apparently for alienating land to pious uses. This appears from the licence for John, parson of the church of St. Benedict, Huntingdon, to retain in frank almoyn a plot of land





GROUP OF ENGLISH EXCHE



ENGLISH EXCHEQUER TALLIES (Side View)

Page 484



100 feet by 80 feet, adjoining his church, heretofore granted to him to inhabit by Richard Baud deceased. 20 June, 1293. *Patent Roll*, 21 Edw. i m. 9.

The name is sometimes given as 'le Baud,' which in the form Lebaud was borne by a soldier of fortune with a chequered career in Scotland in the time of Robert I.

Robert le Venour was appointed sheriff of Lincolnshire on 14 April, 1293.

William de Turevile was appointed sheriff of Beds. and Bucks. on 16 January, 1291, and Nicholas de Tureville on 16 July, 1293.

Although these tallies are not concerned with Scottish matters, there is a name on one of them well known in our annals. Hugh de Cressingham, before his appointment as Treasurer of Scotland in 1296, under the usurpation of Edward I., was one of the King's Justices, so that the reference of the tally is to one of his circuit journeys in that capacity. He held pleas at Lancaster on the octave of the Holy Trinity 1292, at Appleby on the octave of Michaelmas 1292, and at Carlisle on the morrow of All Souls 1292, and at Newcastle on Tyne on the morrow of St. Hilary 1292-3 (*Placita de Quo Warranto* (Record Commission) pp. 369, 786, 112, 585). This appears to be the *Iter* of the tally. Cressingham's share in the battle of Stirling Bridge, and his death there, are commonplaces of history. Hated by the Scots, he evidently was not popular among his own countrymen either. *Homo pomposus et elatus* is Walter of Hemingburgh's characterisation of him. Ralph de Montjoy, whose name appears on the same tally, and who began to account as sheriff of Lancaster at Michaelmas 1291, is found in the records on active service in raising troops in Lancashire for the Scottish campaign against Wallace in 1298.

THE NORSE ATTEMPT ON ERIN.<sup>1</sup> Green Erin was rich in grass; she was rich in woods and fells; she had everything needful for man and beast; but four-footed animals were scarce in Erin, and man was rarer still.

In Suamabheal Bheag lived a Chailleach Ghlás, and she had one son. On Suamabheal Mhor lived a Chailleach Bhlaosg, and she had neither kith nor kin. And there was deadly enmity between the two hags, and the great witch of Suamabheal Mhor took counsel how to compass the destruction of her sister of Suamabheal Bheag; for the sister herself, in virtue of her 'draoidheachd,' was immune from her attempts.

There was a loch in a glen, a wide loch and a long loch, and it was from this loch that the witch-son was wont to get his food. Every evening his mother, in pursuit of her unholy avocation, left him,

<sup>1</sup>The Editor of the *S.H.R.* is indebted to Mr. Kenneth MacLeod for having translated 'The Norse attempt on Erin' from Gaelic tales which he had heard repeated in Stornoway by Angus MacLeod, who died in 1906, and by Catherine Young, also of Stornoway, now aged 89.

harshly commanding him to have her dinner ready when she returned the following day. 'One day of the days' she found her son whimpering and no dinner ready. Not loving was her greeting. But he told her how it was. He had gone to the loch as usual; but he found no loch—it had disappeared.

'Ah, ah, my sister, I smell your work here. Thou hast drunk the loch, but before Samhuinn thou shalt restore it,' quoth she; and then turning roughly on her son she growled forth, 'Was there not Cuan mor nan toun<sup>1</sup> at hand? Away,' and she gave him a blow, 'and prepare for me to eat.'

Now the son of this terrible witch was young, but he was so tall and strong that it was his habit to catch the fish in the waters with his hands, and he could never sink in the waters past the knees. But when he walked into the ocean he found himself sinking, and in great fear he rushed back to his parent. She—'the great one'—gave him the power to tread the green ocean without sinking past the waist.

For many a day after this the 'witch-son' gathered his fish; and the dweller in Suamabheal Mhor 'pondered on her next step,' for Samhuinn<sup>2</sup> was at hand. And Samhuinn would see her victorious or discomfited. Accordingly, by her 'draoidheachd'<sup>3</sup> she brought it to pass that no living creature was to be found in the sea within half the length of Erin of the shore; and dire now was the case of the dwellers on Suamabheal Bheag. But not to be dismayed, the less potent witch ordained that a boat should appear to minister to the needs of her son—a boat so sensible to the wafting of the winds as to go through the waters at the speed of the black raven through the sky. And once again were the labours of her enemy brought to naught.

But 'a day of the days' when the witch-son was returning from the scene of his toils, he found himself enveloped in a soft white mist, and he knew not whither to direct his course. Using the 'draoidheachd' with which his mother had gifted him, he was able to dissolve the mists that surrounded him, when suddenly a great whirlwind arose which soon settled into a fierce gale blowing strongly from one quarter of the heavens. Bewildered, but 'with no terror of the roaring green waters about him,' he settled himself down in his boat, which careered like 'heaven-fire' before the winds. In the morning the wind went down, and in the distance he discerned land. He made for this land, and ultimately leapt on shore. 'It was not known what to do now.' But at length he walked inland, and before long found himself overtaking many people, who all seemed to be making for the same place. He knew he was not in Erin, but where he was he didn't know. At length he came to a meadow in a hollow among hills, where he found a great gathering of men. Soon he saw some of those men going forward and running races. But to his eye they seemed to run slow. Again he saw some hurling a smooth rock previously selected by what seemed to be chief men. But in his eyes

<sup>1</sup>Cuan mor nan toun = Great ocean of the waves.

<sup>2</sup>Draoidheachd = Druidism, witchcraft.

<sup>3</sup>Samhuinn = 13th November.

the rock was small when the distance to which it was hurled was considered. His great size had ere now brought upon him the attention of his neighbours, and now his grunt of dissatisfaction drew upon him their wrath. His language was unintelligible to them, but he signified that he wished to become an active participant in the contests. He heaved up the rock and crashed it to treble the distance that it had been thrown before. Amazement seized upon the spectators, amazement and admiration. Suddenly, the 'putter' previously victorious seized a great log, and by a mighty effort tossed it to a great distance, and then turned to the stranger. 'Do that if you can,' seemed to be his speech. But the witch-son, scorning such a missile, looked about him, and seeing a robust tree rising stately above the plain, went forward, and, gripping it with both hands, tore it up by the roots, and with scarcely a pause, heaved it beyond the throw of mortal man. Awe seized upon the beholders. What land bred such men, to whom their own stalwart sons were as boys?

The fate of the witch-son is unknown. Whether he ever returned to Suamabheal, or whether jealous enmity compassed his death remains uncertain. But a great cry went through the land of Lochlann that they should discover the unknown land. And two swift birlinns were sent forth, which returned after many days to tell of a land they had come upon, 'a land richer than Eachland.' And a great fleet was sent forth to view that land, and take possession of it. They came to the 'green island of the grass,' and when the Norse leader saw it, he conceived the daring project of 'taking it with him to Lochlann.' At once he sent a swift ship north to tell of his plan, and to ask that all the ships of Norway should be sent to him—and also a 'ball gaoisid,' made of the mane of the sea-horse.

In due course arrived a great fleet, which darkened the seas; and the 'ball gaoisid' arrived also. A great hole was bored through the rocks of the most prominent headland, and through that hole was passed the rope of sea-horse hair. Tradition fails to specify how the 'ball gaoisid' was thereupon passed on board each ship; but by it each ship was linked to each, and all to the island. All being ready, the great fleet set sail, and slowly, very slowly at first, moved northwards—the great mass of land plunging heavily after them, like a monster 'maois' of seaweed slowly piloted home. Suddenly something was felt to give, but nothing could be done but sail on.

But 'one day of the days,' as the great fleet proceeded northwards, the wind 'became alive,' and soon freshened into a stiff gale. Things were not looking well, when suddenly a loud crack was heard above the roar of the winds—the rope had parted.

What became of the fleet remains untold; but it is true that the Long Island, which had been broken off from Ireland, stuck in mid-ocean, where it remains to this day, the shock having broken it up into numerous islands and islets. And to passers-by is still pointed out the hole which had been bored by the daring Norsemen, the hole known as the 'Eye of the Butt of Lewis.'

## Note

AT the 'Exposition de Portraits peints et dessinés du XII<sup>e</sup> au XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle,' which was open from April to June at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, there were exhibited some portraits of especial interest to students of Scottish History. Two books (both in the MSS. Department) were relics of Ysabeau Stuart, Duchess of Brittany, the daughter of King James I., and both contained pictures of her, which were, therefore, among the earliest examples of authentic Stuart portraits extant. The first of these (No. 46), a 'Book of Hours,' was written about 1441 on the occasion of her marriage to François I., Duke of Brittany, and is signed 'Ysabeau' by her on several pages. The other (53) 'Somme le Roy,' bears the important inscription: 'Ysabeau, ainée fille du roy d'Escoce, duchesse de Bretaigne, Contesse de Montfort et de Richemont, fist faire ce livre—qui le trouvera le luy rende—et le fist escrire a sa dévotion, de la main de Jehan Hubert, en l'an mil-quatre-cents-soixante-quatre,' thus establishing her seniority among the daughters of James I. The book is embellished with a frontispiece containing a portrait of the Duchess, along with those of her daughters Marguerite, wife of François II., Duke of Brittany, and Marie, wife of Jehan de Rohan, and the identification of each is made certain by the arms they bear. Among the large collection of crayon portraits which were shown were some interesting Scottish portraits also. No. 173, it is thought, represented John Stuart, Duke of Albany, Regent of Scotland, executed in the style of Jean Clouet, 'coiffé d'une toque,' and wearing a long beard. No. 233 was the well-known François II., King of France (school of F. Clouet), and 234 and 235 the equally well-known portraits of Mary, Queen of Scots, one as a young girl, and the other 'coiffée du béguin de veuve.' A crayon head of Anne of Denmark, queen of James VI., was also on exhibition, and a head inscribed 'Mme. Flamin,' which could, however, scarcely be an accurate representation of Marie Livingstone, Lady Fleming, the mistress of King Henri II. of France, as it represented the subject as being still young, though dressed in the costume of 1580.

